The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXIII, No. 5 November, 1950

CONTENTS

Theological Content of *Humani Generis*
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 321

The Concept of Mary and the Church in the Fathers
George Montague, S.M. 331

Religion in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*
John J. Hardon, S.J. 338

The Personality of the Instructor of Converts
John T. McGinn, C.S.P. 346

The Lesson of the *Humani Generis* . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 359

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

May a High Mass be Considered a Private Mass? . . 379

Genuflection Reserved to the Blessed Sacrament? . . . 380

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, **Washington, D. C.**

Copyright 1950, by The Catholic University of America Press

(Contents Continued from Previous Page)

Among, or Amongst, Women? 380

Frequency of Pontificating of a Protonotary 381

Unpaid Admissions 382

ANALECTA

The Latin Text of the Encyclical Letter *Humani Generis* . 383

BOOK REVIEWS

The Moral Principles Governing the Sin of Detraction and an Application of These Principles to Specific Cases, *by Kenneth B. Moore, O.Carm.* 399

A CHRISTMAS SUGGESTION FOR EVERY PRIEST

Why not give a year's subscription to The American Ecclesiastical Review?

To—Your Priest Friends • The Newly Ordained • Seminarians

Twelve times a year your thoughtful gift will bring renewed spiritual and intellectual inspiration, with gratitude for the giver.
A gift card will be sent on your directive.
Don't wait. Make up your list today.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
The Catholic University of America Press
Washington 17, D. C.

Gentlemen: Please send gift subscription to the following:

Name ....

Address ....

City .... Zone .... State ....

I enclose my check for $ ....

United States, Canada and Foreign $5.00
Special Seminarian Rate $3.50

List additional names on separate sheet.

THEOLOGICAL CONTENT OF *HUMANI GENERIS*

On August 12, 1950, Pope Pius XII issued the Encyclical Letter *Humani generis,* the official Latin text of which is given in this issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review.* It is the most significant and the most comprehensive doctrinal pronouncement promulgated by the present Holy Father in the course of his twelve years as Sovereign Pontiff. Indeed, not since 1907, when Pope Pius X condemned the many errors of Modernism, has so detailed and extensive a list of false teachings been reprobated by an authoritative pronouncement of the Vicar of Christ.

The errors which the Pope lists can be classified under four general headings—philosophy, theology, scripture and the natural sciences. The divisions are not completely exclusive, nor does the Sovereign Pontiff intend them to be so. Thus, under the heading of the positive sciences he discusses the theological problems of polygenism and the evolution of the human body. He is concerned almost exclusively with the aberrations of Catholic scholars, though he devotes a passing mention to some non-Catholics who formerly were adherents of rationalism but have now come to acknowledge the Sacred Scripture, though unfortunately they "spurn the teaching office of the Church, which has been instituted by Christ, Our Lord, to preserve and interpret divine revelation."

In his paternal kindness Pope Pius XII does not designate by name any of the Catholic scholars whose opinions he reproves; but those who are familiar with the scientific literature emanating from Catholic sources in recent years will be able to identify some, at least, of the individuals who have strayed from the path of orthodoxy. On the other hand, one could carefully peruse all the published literature of recent times without finding certain errors denounced by the Pope in *Humani generis.* The reason for this the Sovereign Pontiff himself explains, when, alluding to the scholars whom he reprehends, he says: "Though they are more cautious in their published works, they are more open in their writings intended for private circulation and in conferences and lectures." The full significance of this assertion is maniifested in a statement made several years ago by Père Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., to the effect that since 1934 mimeographed articles have been distributed throughout France to priests, seminarians and intellectual lay persons, containing the most fantastic opinions, including the most extreme form of evolutionism.[1]

The Pope declares that the reasons why certain Catholic philosophers and theologians have undertaken to defend false notions are two: an inordinate desire of novelty through fear of being considered old-fashioned, and an ill-regulated zeal for the conversion of non-Catholics—imprudent "irenics" the Holy Father calls it—which has led these scholars to compromise in matters of Catholic truth, and even to question seriously "whether theology and theological methods, such as with the approval of ecclesiastical authority are found in our schools, should not only be perfected, but also completely reformed in order to promote the more efficacious propagation of the kingdom of Christ everywhere throughout the world among men of every culture and religious opinion."

In discussing philosophical aberrations the Pope mentions those who scorn the philosophy of St. Thomas as outmoded in form, and repeats the command of the Church that future priests be instructed in philosophy "according to the method, doctrine and principles of the Angelic Doctor."[2] He condemns the view that the function of theodicy and ethics is not to prove with certainty anything about God or any other transcendental being, but rather to show that truths which faith teaches about a personal God and about His precepts are perfectly consistent with the necessities of life. This idea, underrating the value of the intellect, the Pope tells us was condemned by the Vatican Council, and by Popes Leo XIII and Pius X.

In the scriptural field the Pope expresses disapproval of some who have taught that immunity from error extends only to those portions of the Bible that treat of God or of moral and religious matters, and who take no account of the analogy of the faith and of the tradition of the Church in interpreting the inspired writings. Furthermore, he says, these scholars uphold a new method of exegesis, which they call symbolic or spiritual. He also reproves those who interpret too freely the historical books of the Old Testament, regarding parts of the scriptural narrative as popular myths inserted into the sacred writings, without taking into account the help of inspiration, through which the writers were rendered immune from any error in selecting and evaluating the events narrated.

---

[1] Cf. Garrigou-Lagrange, *La Synthèse thomiste* (Paris, 1947), Appendix: "La nouvelle theologie, où va-t-elle?" pp. 710 ff.

[2] Canon 1366, § 2.

However, our concern is with the theological content of the *Humani generis.* Undoubtedly, the basic error in this field condemned by the Pope is the "neglect of and even contempt for the teaching authority of the Church" manifested by some scholars, with the result that "this teaching authority is represented by them as a hindrance to progress and an obstacle in the way of science." These individuals wish to modify the concepts by which revealed doctrines have been expressed in the past, substituting new concepts in accord with modern philosophical systems. Some even assert that the mysteries of faith are never expressed adequately, but are proposed only through approximate and ever changeable notions, in which the truth is to some extent expressed but is necessarily distorted.

Beyond doubt the Sovereign Pontiff is referring to a heated controversy which was waged in recent years among some European scholars. A good summary of this controversy is given by Fr. Philip Donnelly, S.J., in *Theological Studies* for 1947 (pp. 471-81; 668-99). The liberal side found its chief defenders in a group of French scholars and writers, including Frs. Daniélou, de Lubac, and Bouillard; the conservative side was upheld vigorously by such writers as Fr. Labourdette and Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange. Now, it is true that certain statements of the former party bear a resemblance to the opinions reprobated in *Humani generis.* Thus, Fr. Bouillard asserted: "A theology which would not be contemporaneous to its age would be a false theology."[3] On the other hand, to the vehement denunciations of their opponents these writers have replied that their meaning has been misinterpreted and misrepresented. Hence it would be unfair to declare absolutely that they have come under the condemnation of the Sovereign Pontiff. Suffice it to say, therefore, that some of the views ascribed to this group of scholars by the conservatives in the debate have been reprobated by the Pope. It would be beyond our scope to consider whether or to what extent these writers actually held these views; though we can be sure that some Catholics have actually proposed the notions reprobated by the Sovereign Pontiff. The Holy Father would not direct his pronouncements against an imaginary adversary.

---

[3] "Une théologie qui ne serait actuelle, serait une théologie fausse" (*Conversion et grâce chez S. Thomas d'Aquin*, 219).

The views which are condemned in this connection, the Sovereign Pontiff adds, not only lead to dogmatic "relativism" but even actually contain it. As is very evident, he continues, the terminology in which doctrines are worded admits of some labor for perfection; and even the Church has not always employed the same words in the same way. But, on the other hand, notions employed by Catholic scholars for centuries to explain revealed truth, based on the principles of perennial philosophy, and chosen under the guidance of revelation itself, may not be cast aside. This is particularly true of those ideas which have been sanctioned by ecumenical councils. To substitute for these hallowed concepts notions based on a philosophic system which will survive only a brief time is not only most imprudent but it renders Catholic doctrine a reed shaken by the wind.

A view championed in recent years by Fr. de Lubac, S.J., is evidently referred to by the Pope's rejection of the opinion of those who "destroy the gratuity of the supernatural order, since God, they say, cannot create intellectual beings without ordering and calling them to the beatific vision." According to Fr. de Lubac, in his work *Surnaturel*, God could not create a spiritual being without ordaining it to the supernatural goal of the beatific vision.

The Pope vigorously asserts that the statements contained in the Encyclical Letters of the Sovereign Pontiffs must be accepted; and if in such official documents the Popes purposely pass judgment on a matter previously under dispute, the matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians. This principle has, indeed, been constantly upheld by most theologians, who have given to the internal assent which Catholics are bound to render to statements of the Encyclicals (even though not pronounced with the exercise of the solemn *magisterium*) the term "religious assent." Evidently, however, Pope Pius XII has become aware that some Catholics have taken it on themselves to reject these authoritative statements or to interpret them in a way contrary to the traditional meaning of the Church, on the score that "in writing such letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their teaching authority." Hence, he has deemed it appropriate to remind us that even to such pronouncements the words of Christ are applicable: "He who heareth you, heareth me."

The theory of the evolution of man from a lower form of life is also treated. The Pope discusses it in the section on the natural sciences, but states that it has a connection with Christian faith. His treatment of this subject is most interesting. He makes it quite clear that he is concerned with the subject of the evolution of the human body only, since the soul of man cannot come into being save through a creative act of God. We may study the problem of the evolution of man's body, he says, provided the opinions both for and against this manner of human origin are weighed and judged with the necessary seriousness, moderation and measure, and provided that we are prepared to submit to any decision the Church may make, since the Church has received from Christ the mission of interpreting authentically the Sacred Scriptures and defending dogmas of faith. Then he adds that some have failed against these norms by acting "as if the origin of the human body from pre-existing and living matter were already completely certain and proved by facts which have been discovered up to now and by reasoning on those facts as if there were nothing in the sources of divine revelation which demands the greatest moderation and caution in this question." Evidently, therefore, the Pope regards it as possible that at some future time adequate proofs will be brought forth to prove that the body of man was evolved from some lower living animal; but he teaches that up to the present such proofs have not been produced.

Some Catholic scholars have, indeed, committed themselves to the opinion that the evolution of the human body is a proved fact. One of the most distinguished writers on this subject in recent times was Cardinal Lienart, Archbishop of Lille, whose article in *Études* has been interpreted as favoring this view.[4]

The theory of polygenism is also treated in *Humani generis*. According to this view the present human race is descended not from a single couple, but from a number of different couples. The articles on "Polygénisme" in the *Dictionnaire de théologie cathol-*

---

[4] *Études*, Vol. 255 (1947), 289-300. Though I have read the article carefully, I am uncertain whether the author intends to propose the evolution of the human body as a proved fact or only as an hypothesis which could be reconciled with Catholic doctrine in the event that it were proved.

ique[5] informs us that the hypothesis has been proposed (though the authors of this article refuse to take any stand on the question) that the original sin was committed, not by one pair but by a number of persons, and that the comparison made by St. Paul between Adam and Christ should not be interpreted as indicating the origin of all men from one ancestor, but rather as emphasizing the universality of sin and redemption. Evidently it was in contravention of this hypothesis that the Pope asserts that "the faithful cannot embrace that opinion which maintains either that after Adam there existed on this earth true men who did not take their origin through natural generation from him as from the first parent of all, or that Adam represents a certain number of first parents." Such an opinion, he adds, cannot be reconciled with the teachings of revelation and of the Church regarding the transmission of original sin through generation from one individual to all human beings.

Seven years ago, in his Encyclical *Mystici Corporis,* Pope Pius XII clearly stated that the Mystical Body of Christ is identical with the visible Catholic Church. Apparently, some have not hesitated to deny this truth, and have continued to regard the Mystical Body as an invisible organization, more extensive than the visible Church, embracing even non-Catholics. The Pope takes occasion in *Humani generis* to remind Catholics of the doctrine which he has previously proposed. He also states that some are reducing to a meaningless formula the doctrine of the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to be saved. He does not enlarge further on this point, but it would appear that he regards these two errors as connected, so that the "meaningless formula" would include such general statements as "To obtain salvation it is sufficient to be in the state of grace" or "to serve God according to one's conscience" without any reference to the visible Catholic Church, which Christ established as the necessary means of salvation for all mankind. To express properly the necessary means of salvation one must state that relation to the visible Catholic Church, at least by implicit desire, is a requisite condition.

Other doctrines which the Pope informs us have been impugned are the power of reason to prove the existence of God by arguments drawn from the created universe, the creation of the universe in time (as opposed to its eternal existence), the freedom of God in creating, His foreknowledge of the free actions of men, the existence of angels as personal beings, the essential distinction between matter and spirit, the Catholic notion of original and actual sin, the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, and even the doctrine of transubstantiation—this last on the score that it is based on an antiquated philosophic notion of substance. Whether any Catholic has gone so far as to deny these articles of Catholic faith in a published work, I do not know; but, at any rate, they have been questioned in the anonymous mimeographed writings of which Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange speaks.

---

[5] Vol. XII, col. 2536.

In a majestic peroration the Pope reminds bishops and the superiors general of religious orders of their duty to take most diligent care that the opinions he proscribes be not advanced in schools, in conferences or in writings, and that they be not taught in any manner to the clergy or the faithful. Teachers in ecclesiastical institutions are warned that they are bound in conscience to observe the norms laid down in *Humani generis* and that, while they should most carefully investigate new questions, they must do so with the necessary prudence and caution. Finally, they are told that they must not practice false "irenics" by thinking that non-Catholics can be brought back to the fold if the entire content of Catholic truth is not sincerely taught to all.

* * * * * * * * * *

The editors of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, all of them members of the faculty of the School of Sacred Theology at The Catholic University of America, are humbly grateful to Almighty God that they have been able to uphold in the pages of this periodical the traditional doctrines of the Catholic Church, which are now confirmed by the authoritative pronouncement of the Vicar of Christ. Some have regarded the editors as too conservative, as too unwilling to adapt theological doctrines to the trend of modern thought. But, in view of this most recent pronouncement of Pope Pius XII, it is quite clear that the policy of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* is in strict accord with the mind of the Catholic Church.

Certainly in these pages the obligation has been stressed of giving unqualified acquiescence to the authoritative pronouncements of the Sovereign Pontiff, even though they did not proceed from his infallible teaching power. Indeed, in the course of the past year an entire series of articles was presented on the binding force of the declarations contained in papal encyclicals. The doctrine of the necessity of the visible Catholic Church as a means of salvation has been explained at length.[6] Tendencies to brush over the more difficult teachings of the Catholic Church in the endeavor to render non-Catholics favorable to the Church have been severely condemned. Thus, in a review-article of a treatise designed to explain the teaching of the Catholic Church this statement was made:

> When a complete exposition of Catholic belief is called for, the winning of good will cannot justify the suppressing or passing over of "hard sayings." When Christ saw many of His followers depart, because He had demanded their intellectual submission to a profound mystery, He remained uncompromising, and even more explicitly repeated that He would give His very flesh and blood for the nourishment of those who would accept Him. Why should we adopt a different course when we are striving to fulfill His command to preach the Gospel to all mankind? [7]

This judgment, we believe, has been confirmed by the statement of Peter's successor: "Let them not think, indulging in false 'irenics' that the dissident and the erring can be happily brought back to the bosom of the Church if the whole truth found in the Church is not sincerely taught to all without corruption or diminution."

Warning has been given in recent issues of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* of the tendencies on the part of certain theologians, which have now been reprobated in *Humani generis*.[8] Such dangers to the faith of Catholics as the Springfield plan, the religious book-list, the indifferentism likely to be engendered by Catholic participation in the Conference of Christians and Jews have been unhesitatingly pointed out in our pages.[9] While these subjects have not been mentioned explicitly in the Encyclical, the editors feel that its spirit is in accord with their policy.

---

[6] Vol. CXIII, 1 (July, 1945), 40 ff.; Vol. CXVIII, 3, 4 (March, April, 1948), 214 ff., 290 ff.; Vol. CXX, 3 (March, 1949), 226 ff.

[7] Vol. CXVIII, 1 (Jan., 1948), 29.

[8] Vol. CXIX, 1, 4 (July, October, 1948), 56 ff., 293 ff.; Vol. CXX, 2 (Feb., 1949), 123 ff.

[9] Vol. CXIV, 1 (Jan., 1946), 1 ff.; Vol. CXIII, 5 (Nov., 1945), 385; Vol. CXV, 3 (Sept., 1946), 219; Vol. CXXI, 4 (Oct., 1949), 341 ff.

Finally, it is interesting to record that in a comment on Fr. de Lubac's views, given in the February, 1950, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, the statement was made—now confirmed by the Pope's declaration—"It is difficult to see how one can hold Fr. de Lubac's theory without rejecting the idea of the supernatural that has been commonly accepted for centuries."

These points are brought out, not—which God forbid—in any boastful spirit, but in simple justice to our readers who naturally wish to know what bearing the teaching of the Encyclical has on the opinions that have appeared in recent years in this periodical.

* * * * * * * * * *

The Encyclical *Humani generis* justifies a serious plea to all priests, but particularly to those who are engaged in the important work of teaching the science of theology to candidates for the priesthood. The Holy Father has told us that some theologians have gone astray by neglecting the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church through an excessive love for novelty and an imprudent desire to show favor to non-Catholics. The declaration of the Sovereign Pontiff is particularly significant in that, despite the anxieties that he must experience in the present world situation and the gigantic tasks imposed on him during Holy Year, he deems the dangers to the faith from within the Church sufficiently alarming to compel him to issue this detailed Encyclical. His fatherly heart is grieved by the fact that even those who are supposed to be the defenders of the faith are putting it in jeopardy.

As a loyal son of the Catholic Church, every theologian should honestly ask himself if he is following the line of opinion and teaching laid down by the Vicar of Christ; and if he finds that he has gone astray in any respect, he should at once correct his views. Theologians are not forbidden to study new theories. Indeed, the Pope urges us to do so. But ever and always our judgment must be guided by the voice of the Church which Jesus Christ has promised to protect from error. Our teachings must not deviate from the way pointed out to us by the successors of Peter, to whom the Master promised the unfailing protection of the Holy Spirit. In God's name, let us be docile and obedient, and not fail in our exalted task of explaining in its integrity the faith which the Son of God committed to the care of His infallible Church.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for November, 1900, the leading article, contributed by Fr. Alexander MacDonald, is entitled "The Sacrificial Idea in the Mass." His main contention is that the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross. "It is the immolation of Christ upon the Cross, together with the fact that the same Victim is really present upon the Altar offered by the same High Priest which makes the Mass the distinctive and never-failing sacrifice of the New Testament." . . . Fr. Anselm Kroll contributes an article on "The Support of Sick and Old Clergymen." He explain in detail the canonical provisions for the support of the clergy, and admits that it is very difficult to determine the best method of extending relief to deserving but needy ecclesiastics. He promises to discuss this problem in a future article. . . . Under the heading "Scholastic Methods, their Advantages and Disadvantages" Fr. J. R. Slattery makes some suggestions for improving the method of teaching theology in our seminaries. . . . A response in the Conference section asserts that the bridal couple may kneel within the sanctuary during the Nuptial Mass. . . . A form for the blessing of a couple on the occasion of their silver or golden jubilee of marriage is suggested. . . . Mention is made of a letter sent by the Holy See to the bishops of the United States commanding that in the event that a single Mass is celebrated on All Souls' Day for the deceased whose names are proposed by the parishioners (many offerings being given), a notice should be posted in the church making it clear that only one Mass is being offered.

F. J. C.

THE CONCEPT OF MARY AND THE CHURCH IN THE FATHERS

The past one hundred years of the Church's history have been marked by a phenomenal increase of Marian thought and devotion that is paralleled perhaps only by the great Marian vitality of the Middle Ages. Since the definition of the dogma of Mary's Immaculate Conception, popular devotion to the Mother of God, under the influence of such manifestly supernatural interventions as Lourdes and Fatima, has grown into a kind of world trust in her power of intercession. Mariology has blossomed as a field which is preoccupying theological thought as it has never before. The Sovereign Pontiffs since Pius IX have been consistently outspoken regarding the privileges of Mary, and have urged the members of Holy Church to turn with filial confidence to her to avert world disaster and to bring peace. Not least of these papal acts was the consecration of the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary by Pope Pius XII, October 31, 1942. The Holy Year of 1950, with its solemn proclamation of the dogma of Mary's Assumption, has crowned a century that began with the proclamation of her Immaculate Conception.

If one considers Mary's role in the Church history of the past century, and the fact that this role has had an intimate influence on the life and growth of the Church, the question may legitimately be asked: what relationship exists between Mary and the Church which gives significance to these Marian events? In seeking an answer to this question, we instinctively turn for enlightenment to Catholic tradition, to the works of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. An answer, at least in its seed-form, was offered by the early Church Fathers, and an examination of their statements on the subject may perhaps give a greater theological perspective to current Marian history.

In Patristic language Mary is identified, so to speak, with the Church; in many instances she is even *called* the Church. The Fathers use the same terms to exalt Mary and explain her prerogatives as they use for the Church, and apply interchangeably, as with equal fitness, the same figures, types and prophecies to Mary as to the Church. The two main bases on which the Fathers draw this parallel are the motherhood of the Church compared and identified with the motherhood of Mary; and the Church as the Virgin-bride of Christ compared with the similar role of Mary.

St. Ambrose in one passage speaks of the Church as the type of Mary, but the common practice among the Fathers was to consider Mary as personifying the Church. "The Virgin Mary is . . . the figure of the Church, which received the first fruits of the Gospel," wrote St. Ephrem.[1] "Let us call the Church by the name of Mary, for she is worthy of the double name." The Virgin Mary appears, then, as personifying most perfectly humanity, wed virginally to the Incarnate Word, the receiver of divine revelation and responding with perfect fidelity to the whisperings of the Divine Bridegroom. "Here [in the virginity of His mother] He chose for Himself a chaste bridal chamber wherein He might be united as the bridegroom with the bride."[2]

It is also in her motherhood of the historical Jesus that a parallel is drawn between Mary and the Church. Mary is the Mother of Jesus, the Church, the Mother of Christians. Thus, St. Methodius interprets the Woman in the Apocalypse as literally signifying Mary, and mystically signifying the Church.

Most often, however, motherhood and virginity, which are proper to both Mary and the Church, are considered in the one concept of a fruitful virginal or bridal-motherhood. St. Ambrose speaks of the Church's fecundity thus: "It is a virgin who has borne us in her womb, a virgin who has brought us forth, a virgin who has nourished us with her own milk."[3] Elsewhere he points to Mary as the type of this, the Church's virginal fruitfulness:

> It was fitting that Mary should be espoused and at the same time a Virgin; because she is the type of the Church, which is spotless, yet married. For virgin she [the Church] has conceived us of the Spirit, and virgin, without pangs she has given us birth.[4]

St. Augustine concurs with the Bishop of Milan:

> The Church . . . imitating Christ's Mother every day gives birth to

---

[1] *Sermo ad Nocturnum Dominicae Resurrectionis,* 2, 3, Lamy I, 531-537. Quoted in Thomas Livius, C.SS.R., *The Blessed Virgin in the Fathers of the First Six Centuries* (London: Burns and Oates, Ltd.; N. Y.: Benziger, 1893), p. 268. Subsequent texts of the Fathers are as given in Livius.

[2] St. Augustine, *Enarrat. in Ps.* CXLVIII, n. 8. Livius, 276.

[3] *De Officiis Ministrorum,* Lib. I, cap. 5, 22. Livius, 270.

[4] *In Luc.* L. II, n. 7. Livius, 271.

His members and is a virgin.[5] Did not the holy Virgin Mary both bring forth and remain a Virgin? So, too, the Church brings forth and is a virgin. And if thou reflectest, she gives birth to Christ, because those who are baptised are his members. *You,* says the Apostle, *are the body of Christ, and members.* If, therefore, she gives birth to Christ's members, she is most like Mary.[6] See we not under the figure of Mary the type of the holy Church? For on her too, as you know, the Holy Ghost came down; her too the power of the Most High overshadowed, and from her goes forth Christ, mighty in power. The Church is an immaculate bride, fruitful in child-bearing, virgin in chastity. She conceived not from man, but by the Spirit. She gives birth not in sorrow, but in joy. She nurtures not with breast of body, but with milk of the Teacher. Hence is she the Spouse of Christ, and Mother of the nations, who marvels at seeing herself with child, and rejoices when she has brought forth.[7]

Two hundred years later, but still in the Patristic tradition, St. Isidore of Seville repeated: "Mary signifies the Church, which being espoused to Christ, as a virgin hath conceived us of the Holy Ghost, and as a virgin hath also given us birth."[8]

The Fathers in these passages seem to be satisfied with *comparing* the Church's fruitfulness with that of Mary, and do not explicitly declare, as is now often declared, that the Church's maternity is, in effect, Mary's spiritual Motherhood of men. The passages cited involve primarily an analogy between the Spiritual Maternity of the Church, and the natural maternity of Mary. Even when St. Augustine speaks of giving "birth to Christ's members," it is "the Church *imitating* Christ's Mother"—which would leave Mary's Spiritual Maternity at best only implied, not directly stated.

Nevertheless, some of the Fathers have gone so far as to apply the name of the Church itself to Mary.

"O mystic marvel!" wrote St. Clement of Alexandria. "One Father of all things and one Word of all things and the Holy Ghost, One and the same everywhere, and one only Mother Virgin. Dear to me it is *to call her the Church.*"[9] In a manuscript attributed to St. Methodius, these words occur in praise of Mary: "With hymns, O blessed Spouse of God, adorning the bridal bed, we now venerate thee, *pure virgin Church* of snowy body. . . ."[10] The heresiarch Manes' ironic use of the term "that most chaste Virgin and immaculate Church" refering to Mary seems to indicate that this was a phrase then commonly received and used.[11] St. Cyril of Alexandria closes one of his homilies thus: "Hymning with canticles the ever-Virgin Mary, *that is to say, the holy Church,* and her Son and spotless Spouse. . . . Amen."[12]

---

[5] *Enchirid. ad Laurentium*, cap. 34. Livius, 275.

[6] *Serm.* 213, cap. 7. Livius, 275.

[7] Serm. 121, *De Nat. Dom.* v. 5, Int. Opp. S. Augustini, Append. Livius, 276. This quotation, although of doubtful authenticity, is included as not being foreign to St. Augustine's thought, but rather as an elaboration of it.

[8] Allegoriae ex N. Test. Ap. Morales Lib. II, Tr. 6. Livius, 277.

These passages are to be interpreted primarily in a metaphorical sense, for evidently Mary is not, in the words of the Baltimore Catechism, "the congregation of all baptized persons united in the same true faith, the same sacrifice, and the same sacraments, under the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff and the bishops in communion with him." But some of the Fathers wrote about a compenetration of the two ideas. In at least two respects the Patristic view presents a real "overlapping"—the first, in that Mary is *part* of the Church, is the most perfect member of the Mystical Body; the second, in that Mary's maternity has for its object and effect the bestowal of divine life upon the human race, which is likewise the object and effect of the Church's historical existence. Among the writings of St. Ambrose is to be found a commentary on the Apocalypse in which we find this thought expressed that by the Woman here we may understand the Blessed Virgin Mary, because she is the Mother of the Church, for she brought forth Him who is the Head of the Church, and is herself daughter of the Church, since she is the greatest member of the Church.[13]

The Fathers followed St. Paul closely in holding that the Church is the Bride of Christ. Not yet perfect because of her human members, she grows into an ever closer union with Him through submissive fidelity to His grace until the day of His coming. She desires to be His perfect complement, to "fill up" what is lacking to Him, and in this sense her way of acting may be called a real *seeking* of Christ. That Mary is the model of this seeking of

---

[9] *Paedagogus,* Lib. I, c. 6, *MPG,* VIII, 301. Livius, 264.

[10] *Dec. Virg.* or. I, c. 5, p. 45. Livius, 266.

[11] Cf. Livius, 265.

[12] *Hom.* IV ad fin. Livius, 277.

[13] Int. Opp. St. Ambrosi. Cf. *In Luc.* Lib. X, n. 134. Livius, 271.

Christ seems to be implied in a number of passages of the Fathers. In the Old Testament this striving for union with the Bridegroom was expressed and prefigured in the *Canticle of Canticles.* The Fathers in commenting upon this Book of the Old Law place the words of the Bride upon the lips of both Mary and the Church. "Mary is that beautiful spouse of the Canticles who put off the old garment, washed her feet, and received the immortal Bridegroom within her own bride-chamber."[14] Upon the text, "Let Him kiss me with the kisses of His mouth," St. Ambrose remarks:

> Hereby is signified the grace of the Holy Spirit coming down from above, as the Angel said to Mary: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee."[15]
>
> The Church ceases not to kiss the feet of Christ; and hence in the Canticle of Canticles, she is not content with one but with many kisses. For like holy Mary, she is intent on all His utterances, and takes in all His words. When the Gospel or a Prophet is being read, she keeps all His sayings in her heart.[16]

The view that Mary in her vicarious representation of humanity-to-be-redeemed personifies the perfect way of acting toward the Divine Bridegroom, the perfection of the Church in its members, has been brought into prominence of late in Pope Pius XII's *Mystici Corporis:*

> Her sinless soul was filled with the divine Spirit of Jesus Christ more than all other created souls . . . she more than all the faithful "filled up those things that are wanting of the suffering of Christ . . . for His body which is the Church."

And the Pontiff is at pains to point out that her whole life exemplifies the perfect way of acting toward Christ. She seeks only His will at the Annunciation; with motherly tenderness she brings Him forth and nurtures His childhood; she is the mistress of His hidden life; in his public life she is His *alter ipse,* the only complete triumph of His apostolate; she surrenders her maternal rights over Him at His passion and death. . . . Finally, after His ascension, she is left for a time upon earth to mother the infant Church and to be the living exemplar of the great lesson Christ wished to teach His Church: that the living Christ is to be sought and found in the living Church. "She continued to show for the Mystical Body of Christ, born from the pierced Heart of the Savior, the same Mother's care and ardent love with which she clasped the Infant Jesus to her warm and nourishing breast."

---

[14] S. Proclus, Orat. VI. 17. *De Deip. laudibus.* Livius, 98.

[15] S. Ambrose, *in Ps.* CXVIII. *Serm.* II, n. 16. Livius, 92.

[16] *Epist.* XLI, 18.

If the view be accepted that Mary personified perfect incorporation in Christ, then the Church's ideal, the purpose of its action, was realized perfectly *only* in her; and thus the Church's ultimate goal—her presentation to Christ "in all her glory, not having spot or wrinkle" (*Eph.* 5, 27)—was foreshadowed from the very beginning. For nowhere in its history has the Church's perfect *way of acting* (its utterly perfect co-operating fidelity to grace) been embodied, save in Mary. The Saints have, in varying degrees of perfection, exemplified the Church's way of acting, but to Mary alone should be reserved the glory of being the prototype and spotless exemplar. The question at least deserves consideration and study.

The Church's maternity is, in fact, Mary's spiritual motherhood of all men. Of all the Fathers, it was St. Augustine who explained this most clearly. While stating that "Mary corporally gave birth to the Head of this (Mystical) body, the Church spiritually gives birth to the members of that Head,"[17] he shows that Mary is in very truth Mother likewise of all the members, and consequently, the Church's ministerial action is the application, throughout the time and space of history, of Mary's spiritual motherhood of all men. "She is clearly the spiritual Mother of His members, which we are; because she co-operated by her charity, that the faithful might be born into the Church; and these are the members of that same Head."[18] The predominant patristic concept of the New Adam and the New Eve as parents of the regenerated human race shows likewise Mary's role as Mother of the redeemed, not merely in being Mother of Jesus' natural body, but also by an active co-operation with the entire divine plan of redemption. "Death by Eve, life by Mary."[19] Modern terminology has sought to reduce the apparent complexity of Mary's double maternity (that of Jesus and that of mankind) in the one concept of her motherhood of the Whole Christ.

---

[17] *De Sanct. Virginit. cap.* II, *MPL,* XL. Livius, 275 f.

[18] *Ibid.,* cap. VI, Livius, 276.

[19] St. Jerome, *Ep.* 22, *ad Eustoch.* 21.

Today, when the Church is faced with one of its greatest crises, and when, on the other hand, she is throwing open her mystical treasures with an unprecedented effluence, it is not surprising to find that the Holy Father should close his masterly treatise on the Church as the Mystical Body thus:

"May she, then, most holy Mother of all Christ's members, to whose Immaculate Heart we have trustingly consecrated all men, her body and soul refulgent with the glory of heaven where she reigns with her Son—may she never cease to beg from Him that a continuous and copious flow of graces may pass from its glorious Head into all the members of the Mystical Body. May she throw about the Church today, as in times gone by, the mantle of her protection and obtain from God that now at last the Church and all mankind may enjoy more peaceful days."

George Montague, S.M.

Mt. St. John
Dayton, Ohio

The Priest's Task

It is the priest's task to clear away from men's minds the mass of prejudices and misunderstandings which hostile adversaries have piled up; the modern mind is eager for the truth, and the priest should be able to point it out with serene frankness; there are souls still hesitating, distressed by doubts, and the priest should inspire courage and trust, and guide them with calm security to the safe port of faith, faith accepted by both head and heart; error makes its onslaughts, arrogant and persistent, and the priest should know how to meet them with a defense vigorous and active, yet solid and unruffied. . . .

Therefore, Venerable Brethren, it is necessary that the priest, even among the absorbing tasks of his charge, and ever with a view to it, should continue his theological studies with unremitting zeal. The knowledge acquired at the seminary is indeed a sufficient foundation with which to begin; but it must be grasped more thoroughly, and perfected by an ever-increasing knowledge and understanding of the sacred sciences. Herein is the source of effective preaching and of influence over the souls of others.

Pope Pius XI, *The Catholic Priesthood* (America Press), pp. 23 f.

RELIGION IN THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA*

The anti-Catholic bias of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* has been noticeably decreasing in the last twenty years. As late as the eleventh edition, Conybeare's article on the Eucharist was an attempted refutation of the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence. "To the modern mind," he concluded, "it is absurd that an image or symbol should be taken for that which is imaged or symbolized."[1] By 1946, however, not a syllable of the original polemic is retained. In fact, the new contributor is almost Catholic in his reverence for the Blessed Sacrament, taking sides against the Calvinian symbolist theory of the Eucharist and declaring, correctly, that before Luther's break with the Church, "the doctrine of transubstantiation was all but universally accepted" in the Christian world.[2] Again in 1936, when a new edition of the Encyclopaedia was presented by the publishers to Cardinal Pacelli, on his visit to the United States, volume 13 of the set contained the notorious article on the Society of Jesus. Shortly afterwards another volume 13 was sent to the Cardinal, but this time containing a revised article on the Jesuits, written by Francis Talbot, the editor of *America*.

It is unfortunate, therefore, that these editors did not go far enough in clearing their publication of all prejudice against the Church, especially when so many Catholic institutions use the *Britannica* as a standard reference work but always have to warn their people against the articles on religion, which are frequently tainted with heresy and sometimes are openly hostile to Catholic thought.

A real contribution to the cause of Christ in England and America would be a critical analysis, from the Catholic viewpoint, of all the articles on religion and Church History which appear in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Only a sample of what should be done, can be given here. Two examples of offensive articles were chosen, quite at random, from the same volume 14 of the 1946 edition of the *Britannica*.

The first is an over-lengthy biography of Martin Luther, which begins by calling him a "great religious reformer," and after eleven thousand words of unstinted praise, ends by comparing him to

[1] IX, 876.

[2] VIII, 797.

Jeremiah, who was chosen by God "to tear up and break down, to plant and to build," on the ruins of the Roman Church which he helped to destoy. James MacKinnon, professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Edinburgh and author of several volumes on the Reformation, wrote the present article.[3]

Luther's "conversion" is explained by MacKinnon as a marvelous discovery, based on experience, that tranquility of mind is not to be found in fidelity to the practices of Roman Catholicism. As a monk at Wittenberg, "Despite the most punctilious performance of the minutiae of the rule of his order, the most rigorous asceticism, he [Luther] . . . failed to find peace of conscience, or the assurance of acceptance in the sight of God."[4] The plain fact is that Luther was anything but as punctilious and ascetical as the *Britannica* suggests. Long before his defection from the Church, he wrote in a confidential letter that he was so busy that, "It is seldom I have time for the recitation of the Divine Office or to celebrate Mass."[5] Grisar justly remarks on this confession that it was his duty to arrange his affairs so as to be able to comply with these obligations. The canonical hours were strictly prescribed. Saying Mass is a central obligation of every priest. "If Luther did not know how to observe due moderation in his labors; if he was derelict in the principal duties of the spiritual life, it was to be feared that he would gradually drift away from the religious state."[6] There was no question, therefore, of a "long spiritual struggle in the quest for a gracious God," but a long-standing neglect of prayer and the ordinary sources of grace which slowly weakened Luther's resistance to passion and temptation and finally ended in his apostacy from the Faith.

MacKinnon quotes Melancthon with favor in the latter's estimate of Luther, who, "in his role as a prophet sent by God . . . rediscovered and vindicated the Gospel and delivered the Church from the corruption and tyranny of Rome. . . . He belonged to the long line of God-inspired teachers and leaders who from the days of the patriarchs onwards had successfully preserved and renewed the Church. In this succession he was worthy to stand beside Isaiah, John the Baptist, Paul, Augustine."[7] But if Luther was inspired by the good Spirit, as he claimed, how explain the manifest violations of God's law, which this reputedly good Spirit led him to commit? Was it under Divine inspiration that he penned those terrible lines, "God does not save those who merely fancy themselves sinners. Be a sinner and sin boldly, but believe more boldly still"?[8] Was it also under Divine inspiration that he countermanded the injunction of Christ, by telling his followers, "Every individual ought to be free wlth regard to the reception of the Sacraments. If anyone does not wish to be baptized, let him please himself about it. If anyone does not wish to receive Holy Communion, that is his precious right"?[9] Moreover, the Spirit of God is chaste and undefiled, and inspires purity in those whom it fills. To say, as Luther did, of his sacrilegious union with Catherine Bora, that, "God willed it. The Lord plunged me suddenly into matrimony, while I still clung to quite other views," is nothing short of blasphemy.[10]

---

[3] XIV, 491-498.

[4] *Ibid.*, 492.

[5] Letter to John Lang, in Grisar, *Luther*, I, 275.

[6] Grisar, *Luther*, one volume edition, p. 62.

In the entire scope of German letters, says a modern historian, there is nothing that may be compared with the excrescences of Luther's eloquence. His *Table Talks,* in six volumes, have been not unjustly called "a collection of obscenities." The students around his table frequently indicated Luther's remarks in their manuscripts by signs, such as "I" or "X," where their pen hesitated to express the lewd words of the master. Schatzger, one of the mildest of Luther's critics, in rebuking his coarseness and obscenity, says that, "He befouls the face and garments of his foes—notably Rome and the Pope—with such a mass of vituperative filth (*conviciorum stercora*), that they are forced to save themselves by flight from the intolerable stench and dirt."[11] Yet, if the *Britannica* is to be believed, "All who knew him . . . testify to his amiability and kindliness. His utterance was friendly. . . . Undeniable, too, his deep piety . . . his striving to exercise himself in the Christian virtues . . . his continence and his readiness to conciliate."[12] This is pure fiction, which is contradicted not only by Catholics or the enemies of Protestantism, but by anyone who takes the trouble to read a few pages from Luther's own writings.

---

[7] XIV, 497.

[8] *Dr. M. Luthers Briefwechsel,* III, 208.

[9] Grisar, III, 9.

[10] *Ibid.,* II, 175.

[11] *Ibid.,* III, 237.

[12] XIV, 497.

The article on Martin Luther, however, for all its misrepresentation, might be excused as a piece of emotionalism, where the author's historical judgment is obscured by his devotion to "the great German reformer." It is not so easy to excuse another article—our second example—which occurs in the same volume 14, under the title of *Mary,* and which deals with the Blessed Mother of God. The article is unsigned, but whoever composed it was a rationalist with a mind to discredit all the principal doctrines of Marian theology.

"In early life," he says of Mary, "she became the wife of Joseph and the mother of Jesus Christ. That she afterward had other children is inferred by some—including the author—from Matthew 1/25."[13] Oblivious of the Gospel text which he contradicts, he tells his readers that the doctrine of Mary's perpetual virginity "was, to say the least, of no importance in the eyes of the evangelists." But maybe there is a basis for this doctrine in early ecclesiastical history? Not much. ". . . So far as extant writings go, there is no evidence of its having been taught anywhere within the pale of the Catholic Church of the first three centuries." Consequently, the virginity of the Blessed Virgin is, "in reality a doctrine of non-Catholic origin and first occurs in the so-called *Protoevangelium Jacobi,* which is a "very early romance."[14]

The virginity of Christ's Mother is supposed to have been of no importance to the evangelists. Why, then, do they make an issue of it and stress it so clearly? At the Annunciation, in the Gospel of St. Luke, the first recorded words of the Blessed Virgin are a question addressed to the angel when he tells her that she is to become the Mother of God. "How shall this be," she asks him, "for I do not know man?"[15] Christian tradition has always taken this passage as indicating not only Mary's virginity but also her perpetual vow of chastity. St. Augustine, in commenting on the text, explains that, "She would not have asked this question of the angel unless she had already vowed her virginity to God."[16]

Again in St. Matthew, the evangelist describes with poignant detail the dramatic incident where Joseph is torn between his confidence in Mary's virginity and the injunction of the law to put away his wife because she was obviously, though mysteriously, with-child. The angel bids Joseph not to fear to take unto himself Mary his wife, for that which is conceived in her is not of man but of the Holy Ghost. Then in explanation of this unique miracle of the virgin conception and birth of Christ, the evangelist refers to a famous Old Testament prophecy: "Now all this was done that the word of the prophet might be fulfilled, saying, 'Behold a virgin shall be with-child and bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel.' "[17]

---

[13] *Ibid.,* 999.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] *Luke* 1:34.

[16] *De Sancta Virg.,* 4.

Years later, St. Luke returns to the same idea, at the beginning of Our Lord's public life. Before he gives the genealogy of Christ, from Joseph through David to Adam, he is careful to point out that Jesus was, "as it was supposed, the son of Joseph."

Is it also true, as the *Britannica* asserts, that there is no evidence of the doctrine of Mary's virginity having been taught anywhere in the Catholic Church during the first three centuries? The evidence is all to the contrary, namely, that it was taught everywhere, and very clearly taught, from Apostolic times, during the first three centuries, and ever since. There are two solitary exceptions among the early ecclesiastical writers, Tertullian and Origen, who barely suggested that Mary lost her virginity, not indeed through carnal intercourse before or after Christ was born, but only in giving Him birth. But Tertullian died as a heretic and Origen's teaching was condemned by the Church. Yet these are the very two "authorities"—and the only ones—who are quoted as representing the mind of the Church before the year 300. Whereas the unanimous teaching of the Church and the Fathers, explicitly proclaiming the perpetual virginity of the Mother of God, is passed over in silence.

Christian historians assign the year 100 as approximately the date when the Apostles' Creed was formulated and in general use among the faithful. Which means that already in Apostolic times, the expression, "I believe in Jesus Christ . . . born of the Virgin Mary," was an article of faith to be accepted as a revelation from God.

About A.D. 153, St. Justin told his pagan readers that the virgin birth of Christ should not seem incredible to them when so many of their own pagan writers spoke of the sons of Zeus who were "miraculously" born.[18]

---

[17] *Matt.* 1:20-23.

Also before the year 200, St. Ireneus rebuked the heresiarch Cerinthus for calling into question Mary's virginity which, he said, is "a rule of faith to be held by every believer" under penalty of separation from Christ.[19] And just before the turn of the century, the Platonic philosopher, Celsus, ridiculed the virgin birth of Christ, comparing it with the Greek myths of Danae, Melanippe and Antiope. Origen—the same whom the *Britannica* quotes against Mary's virginity—answered that Celsus wrote more like a buffoon than a philosopher.[20]

In the third century, St. Hippolytus defended Mary's integrity against Noetus, declaring that "this is the tradition of the Apostles."[21]

By the year 400, Catholic witnesses to the traditional doctrine had exhausted their invectives against the enemies of Christ's Mother. St. Jerome devoted a special treatise to the perpetual integrity of Our Lady, in answer to the apostate Helvedius. The contrary doctrine is called "impiety." To Gennadius it was "blasphemy," to Origen "madness," to St. Ambrose "sacrilege," to Epiphanius "a rashness exceeding all bounds," to Philostorgius "atheism," to Augustine "heresy," to Pope Siricius "the perfidy of the Jews." Wrote St. Basil, "Those who love Christ will not brook the assertion that the Mother of God ever ceased to be a virgin."[22] Even Martin Luther, who warned against attributing too much to Mary's intercession because "she is no helping goddess," did not question her virginity *ante et post partum*. It was left to the disciples of Strauss and Renan to deny, besides the Divinity of Christ, the virginity of His Blessed Mother.

The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is also an essential part of Christian revelation. But for the *Britannica* it is only a later development of medieval piety. For "while much of the apocryphal literature of the early sects in which she is spoken of as 'undefiled before God' would seem to encourage some such doctrine as this, many passages from the acknowledged Fathers of the Church could be cited to show that it was originally unknown to Catholicism."[23] In support of this statement, half a sentence is quoted from St. Anselm, the same Doctor who said, "It was meet that the Blessed Virgin should shine in a splendor of purity than which none greater can be conceived under God."[24]

---

[18] *Apologia*, I, 21.

[19] *Adv. Haereses*, lib. 3, c. 19.

[20] *Contra Celsum*, I, 37.

[21] Quoted in R. de Journel, n. 394.

[22] *Homil. in Christi Generationem*, 25.

Previously Mary's chastity was impugned on the grounds that references to it are found in the early legends of her life. Now her Immaculate Conception is denied for the same reason, because "in the apocryphal literature she is repeatedly spoken of as undefiled." It would be just as reasonable to argue that slavery never existed in America because a novelist wrote *Uncle Tom's Cabin* on the subject, or that the Crimean War is a fable because Tennyson mentions it in one of his poems.

For an honest historian of dogma, the question is not whether the apocrypha spoke of Mary as having been conceived without sin, but whether the orthodox writers in early Christianity regarded her as "undefiled before God." To which the answer is: they did, even where, as St. Augustine, they were unable to explain how the Mother of Christ could be redeemed before the Redeemer Himself was born. "The Fathers of the Church," declares Pius IX in his solemn definition, "have testified that the flesh of the Virgin, taken from Adam, did not admit the stains of Adam, but came into the world brilliant as the dawn in her Immaculate Conception."[25] True, in the early stages of its development, the doctrine was not explicitly understood to mean that at the first moment of her existence, the Blessed Virgin was exempt from original sin. But equivalently and implicitly, the Fathers said as much. According to the author in the *Britannica,* the only witnesses in the early Church to Mary's perfect innocence were the legends in the apocrypha. This is not defensible. Ignatius of Antioch, Justin the Martyr, Ireneus, Ephrem, Modestus, Sopronius, Epiphanius, Hippolytus, Dionysius and Augustine—all before A.D. 400—are some of the ancient Fathers who testify to the absolute purity of the Mother of God, and therefore imply that she was conceived without sin. They praise her as "all holy . . . a virginal paradise . . . a virgin without the slightest taint of sin . . . a miracle of grace . . . preserved from the curse of God." No matter how highly we esteem the holiness of a converted sinner, it would be untrue to say, as the Fathers do of Mary, that he is absolutely sinless. To compare her sanctity to the untrammeled purity of the angels and even to exalt her above them, is only another way of saying that she was immaculately conceived. "Most holy Lady, Mother of God," St. Ephrem prays, "alone most pure in soul and body, alone exceeding all perfection of purity, alone made in every respect the home of all the graces of the Most Holy Spirit, and hence exceeding beyond all compare even the angelic virtues in purity and sanctity of soul and body . . . my Lady most holy, all-pure, all-immaculate, all-stainless, all-undefiled, all-incorrupt, all-inviolate . . . spotless robe of Him Who clothes Himself with light as with a garment . . . flower unfading, purple woven by God, alone most immaculate."[26]

---

[23] XIV, 999.

[24] *De Conceptione Virginis,* c. 18.

[25] Bulla, *Ineffabilis Deus,* Dec. 8, 1854.

Looking back on its contents, the editors of the *Britannica* observe in the last volume that, "More than 3800 scholars, experts and men of affairs from all countries of the world, each an authority in his field, have written the articles in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*." Except in the field of religion and religious history, a Catholic is willing to admit that "no other single work has ever appeared with a list of equal weight and distinction." But morals and man's relations with God are at least as important as "arteries" and "artesian wells."

JOHN J. HARDON, S.J.

Provincial Residence
Oak Park, Ill.

---

[26] *Precationes ad Deiparam*, in "Opp. Gr.-Lat.," III, p. 534-37.

OUR LADY AND THE SOULS IN PURGATORY

Mary not only consoles and relieves her clients in purgatory, but she delivers them by her prayers. Gerson says "that on the day of her Assumption into heaven purgatory was entirely emptied." Novarinus confirms this, saying "that it is maintained by many grave authors, that when Mary was going to heaven, she asked as a favor from her Son to take all the souls then in purgatory with her." "And from that time forward," says Gerson, "Mary had the privilege of delivering her servants."

St. Alphonsus, *The Glories of Mary*, p. 233.

THE PERSONALITY OF THE INSTRUCTOR OF CONVERTS

Were you ever faced with the necessity of asking a great favor from a total stranger? The experience is common enough, and few can be more dispiriting. Doubts and forebodings fill your mind as you speculate on the kind of reception in store for you. You shift nervously from one foot to another, twirl your hat, and are ready to abandon the project on the slightest pretext. A similar anxiety plagues interested non-Catholics who decide to approach a priest with a view to taking instructions. "What sort of person is he?"—this is their paramount concern. Matters like the credentials of the Church and her manifold teachings are waived until prior considerations are settled. "Will this priest be reasonably gracious, understanding, sympathetic? Or will he be preoccupied, unapproachable, on edge?"

This instinctive concern about the personal quality of the catechist is quite understandable and largely justified by our own principles. Teaching religion is a problem in theology, but it is also a task in pedagogy. It is a supernatural work wherein the teacher collaborates with the Holy Spirit; but it is likewise a labor of education. Two minds must meet; two human persons must establish sympathetic contact and heartfelt accord. And this initial agreement will be partly human, natural, and psychological. True, the eminently priestly work of instructing catechumens should proceed from grace and be transformed by the charity of Christ. But grace presupposes nature and does not destroy it. And while the catechist must never forget his dependence on God, experience amply demonstrates that his attractive or repellent personal traits have much to do with determining whether the neophyte will be docile or unreceptive to the action of God's Spirit. In God's redemptive purpose, a prominent role is assigned to the priest, and his personality may very well fall into that order of external graces which help dispose a soul for conversion.

Extraordinarily successful convert-makers are highly individualistic and cast in no single moulds. Yet when considered as persons, they do disclose a remarkable similarity in certain respects. As a rule, they are uniformly *kind* and inspire *confidence,* they have large reserves of *patience* and teach *enthusiastically*.

KINDNESS

A confrère who was notably effective on missions to non-Catholics, wryly remarked concerning his more talented mission partners: "They provided the ability and I the *affability*." He was one of those who remembered St. Augustine's observation concerning his early association with St. Ambrose: "I came to love him, not at first as a teacher of the truth, which I had utterly dispaired of finding in Your Church, but for his kindness towards me."

Our inquirer, in common with all men, stands at the center of his own individual universe; and he is inclined to measure men and values as they affect him personally. Unless he is abnormal, he reaches out with an elemental longing for personal interest in himself and his problems, for esteem and for cordial friendship. People in the hills of Tennessee wistfully bid departing friends "Hurry back!" And the cosmopolitan artist or savant does not suppress a glow of pride at the applause or prize accorded some personal triumph.

All this becomes especially significant whenever two people collaborate closely. The warmth of their personal relationship then becomes a prime factor in the accomplishment of their common objective. I once knew a promising physician whose advance was tragically impeded by his extreme boorishness with his patients. And in the air corps they like to repeat the remark of an officer who was briefing two volunteers for a hazardous mission: "On a mission of this sort, two fliers will almost certainly fail; only a team can carry it off." Indeed, in any realm where men are considered for responsible posts, attention must be given not only to their technical proficiency but also to their capacity for working amicably with their immediate associates.

No one has less reason to neglect these truisms than the instructor of converts. Priest and inquirer are destined to hold long interviews over an extended period, exploring truths pre-eminently personal and far-reaching in the response they demand. We ask a man to abandon cherished opinions, tenacious prejudices, and comfortable habits. Ultimately, we require him to make an unique and unqualified submission to Christ in His Church. To be sure, we ask nothing that is contrary to reason; and, with God's illuminating and inspiring grace, he eventually comes to enjoy a priceless heritage. For the moment, however, he may be overwhelmingly conscious only of the fact that we are endeavoring to persuade him to reorganize his entire life. Never were the stakes so high!

Is it surprising that he will be uncommonly alert—even hypersensitive? that he will swiftly detect and thoroughly resent anything like coolness, perfunctory treatment—not to speak of arrogance or hostility? Especially in the early lessons, before friendly relations have been cemented, he may scrutinize his guide more closely than the path he is to travel. For few men are so completely dispassionate as to gaze exclusively and impersonally at objective truth. "Persons influence us," says Newman, "voices melt us, looks subdue us, deeds inflame us." Hence the motto of the great Cardinal, which was also his rule of life, *Cor ad cor loquitur.*

Some men seem born with geniality in their blood. Being approachable, unceremonious, and cordial comes easy to them. But the lack of this native disposition certainly should present no insuperable obstacle to him who is Christ's own ambassador. Recall how frequently St. Paul describes our Lord as the kindness of God appearing on earth! To be sure, there is no worth in gushing sentimentality or in calculated back-slapping. Professional heartiness or spurious cordiality can be more jarring than a tenor off key. Yet certain simple, unfeigned touches—a warm welcome, an engaging informality, a ready sense of humor, manifesting interest in some critical matter known to engage a man's anxious thought—these alone will take us a long way to the heart of another.

Some of us were once discussing the reason for the signal success of an assistant at one of our Information Centers. Aside from other talents, we agreed that his outstanding gift was a deep, genuine personal interest in his neophytes. This manifests itself in various ways, but most noticeably in his manner of meeting people. He gradually comes to know much about their jobs, families, hobbies, interests, and problems. Whereas some of us, especially when busy or when an inquirer arrives late, might be inclined to give short shrift to the amenities and plunge all too abruptly into the evening's lesson; he never neglects to devote a few moments to good-humored banter or solicitous concern for some current interest that is uppermost in their minds. He never has to assure people of his willingness to help; they know it from the start.

Incidentally, kindliness is a quality which we Catholics esteem highly in those who minister to us. We realize that legitimate authority and the divinely established means of grace are not essentially vitiated by a priest's disagreeable personal traits. At the same time, those preachers, confessors, pastors, or superiors who bring a warm kindness to their ministrations seem to stir us more readily and enduringly than others. We of the household of faith are far from being insensible to the appeal of those who can say with Christ, "I have called you friends." So there is little cause for astonishment that non-Catholics, who do not share our native docility towards the clergy, should be even more sensitive in this regard than ourselves.

HE INSPIRES TRUST

When Cardinal Hinsley died, the London *Tablet* ascribed his far-reaching influence with Britain's non-Catholics to the fact that "he established an immediate relationship of personal trust." His candid recognition of thorny problems, the absence of devious methods in their solution, and the manifest ring of sincerity in his public utterances—all persuaded his non-Catholic countrymen of his utter reliability. The full flavor of the *Tablet's* tribute will best be savored by the veteran convert-maker. For he must constantly contend with mistrust about the Church. And ripened experience teaches him that a neophyte's progress, apart from grace, is very largely the fruit of confidence in his instructor.

Why do some inquirers, after resolving to consult a priest, approach a rectory only to falter at the doorbell and shrink away again and again? And when the lessons do get under way, what induces some neophytes to maintain a tantalizing restraint, or a thinly-disguised wariness, or (in extreme cases) a distressing attitude of suspicion? How is it that we so frequently encounter in convert literature the words "fear," "dread," "trepidation," and "mistrust"? Fortunately, not all our catechumens think the worst of us; and many of them, even from the start, will manifest a trust that is unqualified. Nevertheless, some fear of the Church, ranging from a slight twinge of misgiving all the way to downright alarm, is fairly widespread among non-Catholics.

With some, this uneasiness can be traced to the very nature of conversion itself. The all-Holy, Majestic God has singled out a solitary soul for closer intimacy with Himself. And as Christ said to Angela Foligno, "it is no laughing matter to be loved by God." Little wonder that even the most torpid soul will evidence initial fright when pursued by the Hound of Heaven. For the moment, the sweetness of God's love and the gracious tenderness of Christ's Bride will be hidden. What does appear is the towering bulk and strangeness of Catholicism, the thorough-going changes demanded by conversion, or its irrevocably binding character.

Sometimes a person will be relatively free from these annoying anxieties only to have the seeds of foreboding deliberately sown by another. I once instructed a Jewish girl whose early lessons were plain sailing. Suddenly her attitude changed, and she began to quiz me regarding scandals among the clergy, the "sale" of indulgences and kindred distasteful problems. In time she disclosed that a relative—a physician who had been excoriated by a hospital nun for unethical practice—was the malicious source of these disquieting doubts.

More often this uneasiness will arise from the vast, enduring, concerted effort that is made to discredit the Church. Tireless critics malign everything connected with the Catholic teaching authority—especially the *Imprimatur,* Index, and Roman Congregations—as a shameful restriction of intelligence imposed by those who fear the truth. Our unchanging moral code, along with confession and associations like the Legion of Decency, are denounced as a sinister tyranny designed to enslave the human conscience. A periodic Nativism charges the hierarchy with ambition for political domination that would exile many of the precious freedoms of a liberty-loving people. The Church is thus cast in the role of arch-villian: fantastic in teaching, corrupt in morals, and a powerfully organized superstition insufferably arrogant in her hour of triumph. Is it surprising that even those who do not swallow every detail of this melodramatic indictment will still be vexed by some apprehension?

This fear is rooted less in the active intelligence of the inquirer than in his emotions, feelings, and imagination. Consequently, while we should not neglect to remove the doctrinal and historical misapprehensions which cause disquiet, we must be at pains to dislodge doubt and suspicion in his subconscious mind.

With all this in view, seasoned instructors never tire of insisting that we have nothing to hide and that our paramount desire is the opportunity simply to state our case. They clearly disavow, from the beginning, any intention of roping people into the Church; and repudiate anything like pressure or intimidation in the inquirer's ultimate decision. They are in hearty accord with Msgr. Sheen, who strenuously disapproves of accepting any gratuity from inquirers. And they encourage their catechumens to expose their difficulties without reserve. "You may always say to me just what you think," Fr. Maturin wisely advised one inquirer, "I shall never be shocked." And to another he offered the reassuring counsel, "I don't feel in the least discouraged at anything you have said; I would much rather that you were quite honest and open." In line with this, the writer has found it profitable to suggest that catechumens jot down their questions and problems so as not to forget them when they come for instruction.

When, as must inevitably happen, we are unprepared to give the full and exact answer to some difficulty, we should candidly admit our limitation. After stating what we do know about the subject, we should then promise to investigate the matter, and discuss it on a subsequent visit. People do not expect omniscience of us any more than they do of a physician or a lawyer; and the frank avowal of ignorance on a given point will testify to our fidelity to the truth. Then, too, the serene possession of the truth ought to induce in us a magnanimity that quickly recognizes and approves the virtue to be found among non-Catholics and the fragments of truth they have retained.

Above all, there is no substitute for frankness regarding the defects and scandals on the human side of the Church. The calumnies of bigots and their exaggeration of Catholic shortcomings may engender an indignation that blunts our perspective. This may induce a disinclination to acknowledge obvious Catholic blunders or scandals, past or present, out of reluctance to make "concessions" to an adversary. There is little point in defending the indefensible. The New Testament writers were candid enough. They did not suppress or evade evidence of the denial of Peter, the doubt of Thomas, the desertion of the Twelve, or the reprehensible lives of some of the early converts. And when Leo XIII opened the Vatican Library to the scholars of the world he saw fit to reiterate an admonition of St. Ambrose, "Tell the truth, God has no need of a lie." The least evasion of unpalatable truth; the slightest unfairness; the slick, stock answers—these may seem to support the charge that we are not motivated by love of the truth, but by professional bias for a discredited cause.

In time, the catechumen usually reaches a state of mind that seeks not so much to be convinced as merely to understand. "He who really knows the Church," says Ross Hoffman, "has a deep knowledge of what She is incapable of teaching or doing, just as he knows the same about his mother or anyone with whom he has been dearly or tenderly intimate." But this docility and assurance is generally a later development and the rich fruit of grace; it normally follows a stage wherein the inquirer has attained unreserved reliance on the personal probity of his spiritual guide.

PATIENCE

Let's face it honestly. Instructing inquirers, despite its handsome compensations, entails a prolific brood of annoyances and irritations. And without abundant reserves of plodding, long-suffering patience, it is next to impossible to succeed in making converts. Perhaps that is why St. Thomas felt that the Christian teacher was entitled to a martyr's crown, and why St. Augustine, in his book on catechetics, constantly returns to the subject of weariness and how to overcome it.

An extended series of private or class instructions makes devastating inroads upon our leisure, often conflicts with work more personally congenial, and clashes with other pressing obligations. However sublime the truths we impart, there is apt to be some monotony in covering the same ground with an endless chain of inquirers. Then there is the dull, dreary business of meeting shopworn objections and perennial misconceptions of Catholic teaching. Besides, we usually meet inquirers at the end of the day when they are fagged out by their labors and sometimes listless to the point of apathy. The most irrepressible enthusiasm is likely to be punctured by people who can come only at inconvenient hours, who arrive much too early or late for appointments, or who break engagements without notification. Let one or another of these sources of exasperation occur at a time when the catechist himself is fatigued or troubled, and the fat is really in the fire.

Happily, most of our neophytes are genial, considerate, polite and reasonably docile. Indeed some are either so personally engaging or intellectually stimulating as to render their instruction sheer delight. Nevertheless, others can be unprepossessing in the extreme. One may be crude, unmannerly, and consciously or unconsciously flippant or irreverent concerning beliefs and practices sacred to us. Another may be habitually blunt, argumentative, and captious. Then there is the person who continually flits to a second or third query before you have finished answering his first problem. And the individual who has no problems or difficulties whatsoever, even with the most profound mysteries, is hardly conducive to peace of mind. Perhaps the sharpest harpoons are cast by those whose motives are highly suspect or those who evidence little or no perceptible progress despite our labors.

This abbreviated catalogue of provocations is mentioned, not by way of qualifying us for membership in the "bleeding-hearts" fraternity, but to emphasize the indispensable need of dogged patience. Chronic irritation seldom accomplishes anything of value in any realm. But the consequences of short temper in dealing with non-Catholic inquirers are usually disastrous. Of course, there are occasions when honest indignation is thoroughly justified: holy anger is sometimes a duty. But these occurrences are rare in dealing with people who have spontaneously applied for instruction. Any lack of Christian forebearance may lead us to hasty, unwarranted conclusions that render impossible an accurate diagnosis or adequate treatment of an inquirer's personal problems. And the slightest evidence of testiness on our part may drive a neophyte into a shell of reticence, and may provide him with specious justification for terminating the course. Only a charity that is patient, as well as kind, will enable us to see beyond these superficial annoyances and keep us faithful to a labor that is sometimes unrelieved drudgery.

Even on the merely natural plane, the instructor will find many a touchstone for self-discipline. For one thing, many people fail to explain themselves adequately, and unconsciously convey an entirely erroneous view of their real dispositions. I'll never forget a burly, raucous mining-engineer who seemed to delight in flinging the most embarrassing challenges at me. "Wasn't Alexander VI just as much a dirty dog as Henry VIII?" "Didn't Catholics persecute Protestants just as much as Protestants persecuted Catholics?" He invariably came late and always left as soon as class was dismissed, and I was convinced that he was a professional troublemaker. You may imagine my consternation when he waited one evening until we were alone, and bellowed: "When in high heaven are you going to baptize me?" It then developed that the problems he raised were not personal difficulties at all, but objections put to him by his fellow workmen who learned of his interest in Catholicism; his only concern was to be able to give them the Catholic answer. That his external manner thoroughly belied his real dispositions became clear when he displayed a tattered Catholic booklet on *The Love of God* which he had been reading daily for many years.

Another inquirer may express serious objections to Catholicism, yet may be strongly attached to some particular aspect of the Church which ultimately leads to his conversion. "Don't you think the Catholic Church will one day discard the superstitions she has inherited from medieval times?" The questioner was a newspaperman I met each summer who, despite many obviously good and likable qualities, seemed determined to rub me the wrong way. Fortunately, an open break was avoided, because he one day revealed his unbounded admiration and substantial, practical support for Fr. Flanagan's "Boys' Town." This belated clue enabled me to demonstrate that what he characterized as "medieval superstitions" were actually the supernatural remedies that transformed heedless boys into men of character and responsibility.

It helps to remember that the inquirer himself is often sorely tried. The journey back to his spiritual home is often long and arduous. Even to embark on the journey has entailed humility, effort, and no little courage. Later on, a veritable battle is waged between the forces of heaven and hell for the mastery of his soul, and he will often be tempted to drop the whole matter. How sensitive men are at such moments! Even a brusque gesture, a harsh inflection, or a hint of impationce may tip the scales in the direction of hopelessness and despair.

Ultimately, it is the spirit of Christ which enables us to see the eternal value of every individual soul, the rich potentialities in the most obdurate, and the fact that there are no "hopeless cases" where grace is at work. Our Lord seemed to delight in showering His choicest blessings on the least deserving. He tried to meet people at their best and highest level; and even when there was little outwardly to commend them, He gave generously of His time, His patient teaching, and His gifts. His quest of souls is one long record of heroic endurance in the face of every species of human ugliness. Calculated insolence, colossal ignorance, wilful unbelief, organized opposition—this was the greeting extended to the Truth Incarnate! Christ was crucified at a thousand crossroads before He died on Calvary. And through it all He exhibited a patience that could endure all things save hurt to His Father's honor or the good of souls.

AN ENTHUSIASTIC TEACHER

Teaching in all its forms often suffers from a "bad press" among an energetic, bustling people like our own. "If you can't make a living at it, teach it," says one type of caustic critic. And words like "academic," "theoretical"—not to mention "school marm"—are the ultimate in epithets of disapproval. But the art of teaching does have its champions. And not least among its admirers are those who in mature years, come to embrace the Catholic faith. Converts seldom refer to the priest who introduced them to the Church as the one who "baptized" or "converted" them. "He instructed me" is the way they designate their spiritual guide. And there is no mystery why they accord instinctive and deeply grateful priority to the priestly teaching office. They have been victims of one of the most perplexed and insecure generations since the western world's original conversion to Christianity. And before all else, their spiritual father answered their deepest questions and problems, and imparted to them a noble, satisfying, divinely authenticated body of truth.

A notable pronouncement of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities in 1945, prescribing a course in pedagogy for seminarians, strikingly supports the convert's heartfelt respect for the priestly teaching office:

> From the pages of the Gospel, from the Epistles of the Apostles, and from the entire history of the Church, it is clearly seen that the priest of Christ is not only a minister of divine worship and a sacred officer of the liturgy, but he is also an educator and instructor in the formation of the mind and will of others. Furthermore, according to the command of Christ to the Apostles, the office of teaching has precedence over the sacramental and liturgical ministry: "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them . . ." The reason for the precedence of the teaching office is evident: one cannot enrich the soul with grace if it has not first been enlightened with the truth.

Convert-making, in the last analysis, is the work of the priest-catechist. Catholic literature, moving sermons, good example, the sympathetic kindness of friends—these are preliminary helps or external graces, that remain inconclusive until they induce an inquirer to "take instructions." And when a neophyte visits a priest to investigate the Catholic position, that priest's fundamental attitude towards teaching assumes immense importance. The writer is constantly being asked by priests to recommend popular doctrinal and apologetical literature, catechetical texts and prepared outlines of instructions suitable for convert-instruction. Nor would I minimize their importance. But vastly more decisive is the prevailing attitude towards the teaching of religion revealed by the man who employs these instruments. Is he consumed with the burning conviction that our treasures of eternal truth and divine grace are incomparably the most necessary and precious things in the world? Is he driven by the unconquerable certainty that the ills of our day, which imperil souls and threaten our civilization, ultimately stem from abysmal ignorance of the truth revealed by Christ?

Faith comes by hearing. And it is primarily from the infectious, glowing personality of one who knows and loves the truth, and who delights to impart it, that darkened minds catch their first intimation of the meaning of Catholicism. Priests are not only apostles by vocation; they are by vocation teachers. And no one is so desperately in need of their teaching ministry as the non-Catholics of their parishes. The Catholic clergy are disciples of Him who proudly proclaimed: "For this was I born and for this did I come into the world, to give testimony to the truth." And when a priest enters the rectory parlor to instruct a catechumen, or when he stands before the members of an inquiry class, he should approach his task with the sustained, dedicated zest of an apostle.

The instructor of converts is entrusted with a twofold stewardship. God looks to him to illuminate the sacred mysteries and moral code of Catholicism as truly, as nobly, and as cogently as his talents will allow. And neophytes, because their very salvation is at stake, look to him to impart the very best and deepest insight he has himself attained concerning Almighty God, Christ His Son, and the Church which is His Body and the sure road to eternal happiness.

Any priest who is conscientious, who loves souls and strives continually to comprehend the great design of God for men, can be of immense aid to inquiring non-Catholics. However, as with preaching, the task of instructing converts can utilize gifts of the very highest order. Profound sympathy for those in religious error;

an insight that detects secret spiritual longings; alert recognition of truths a man already honors; imagination, along with eloquence or rhetorical aptitude; a warm personality; an increasing inner appreciation of the truths of faith, a sense of their organic relationships and their far-reaching implications in the whole of life; acquaintance with those modern movements that hinder or minister to the cause of religion; a personal religious spirit formed by the faith we hold, the hope which is our strong support and the charity whereby we love God and souls—all this, and much more, can cooperate fruitfully with grace in winning Christ's "other sheep." Nevertheless it goes without saying that an instructor of modest attainments who with prayerful industry ceaselessly strives to increase his usefulness, will be immeasurably more effective than the gifted man whose talents are permitted to run to seed.

Our inquirer has reacted against an environment which is penetrated and motivated by the blight of secularism. Somehow he has come to realize that there is another way of interpreting the drama that is daily enacted on the world's stage: he has discovered the Catholic outlook. Perhaps over a long period, he has noted that one or more of the details of the Catholic view immediately commend themselves to his sympathies. He then discovers that other details of that philosophy which he was first inclined to reject, later on prove their wisdom or necessity. He finally decides to apply for systematic instructions in the doctrine of the Mother Church of all Christians. He may be already convinced of her majestic claim to possess the mind of Christ. More likely, he may only dimly suspect that she knows the answers to the questions that plague his soul and possesses the helps that save a man in time and in eternity. In any case, he is prepared to investigate the teachings of the Church. By this very fact, he manifests a measure of good will and openmindedness; and God's grace may not be long in coming, even if it is not already at work.

Such a man is inexpressibly fortunate if he consults a priest who manifests kindliness, patience, and candor. But he will be grateful beyond any description, if that priest has faced squarely all the fundamental issues of life—its suffering, sin, doubt, and death, and has himself found a key to their solution and a light for his feet in

Christ and in the Church which teaches in His name. Forever blessed is that inquirer who consults a priest who, like the Apostle Philip, has found the Lord and Light of the world and delights in proclaiming to others, "Come and see."

JOHN T. McGINN, C.S.P.

New York, N. Y.

CARDINAL NEWMAN ON THE IMITATION OF MARY

If the Mother of Emmanuel ought to be the first of creatures in sanctity and in beauty; if it became her to be free from all sin from the very first, and from the moment she received her first grace to begin to merit more; and if such as was her beginning, such was her end, her conception immaculate and her death an assumption . . . what is befitting in the children of such a Mother, but an imitation, in their measure, of her devotion, her meekness, her simplicity, her modesty, and her sweetness? Her glories are not only for the sake of her Son, they are for our sakes also. Let us copy her faith, who received God's messages by the angel without a doubt; her patience, who endured St. Joseph's surprise without a word; her obedience, who went up to Bethlehem in the winter and bore our Lord in a stable; her meditative spirit, who pondered in her heart what she saw and heard about Him: her fortitude, whose heart the sword went through; her self-surrender, who gave Him up during His ministry and consented to His death.

Above all, let us imitate her purity, who, rather than relinquish her virginity, was willing to lose Him for a Son. O my dear children, young men and young women, what need have you of the intercession of the Virgin-mother, of her help, of her pattern, in this respect! What shall bring you forward in the narrow way, if you live in the world, but the thought and patronage of Mary? What shall seal your senses, what shall tranquillise your heart, when sights and sounds of danger are around you, but Mary? What shall give you patience and endurance, when you are wearied out with the length of the conflict with evil, with the unceasing necessity of precautions, with the irksomeness of observing them, with the tediousness of their repetition, with the strain upon your mind, with your forlorn and cheerless condition, but a loving communion with her! She will comfort you in your discouragements, solace you in your fatigues, raise you after your falls, reward you for your successes. She will show you her Son, your God and your all.

John Henry Cardinal Newman, *Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1906), pp. 374 f.

THE LESSON OF THE *HUMANI GENERIS*

Speaking about the purpose of the Catholic Church, the Vatican Council, in its constitution *Dei Filius,* declared that God had brought this society into being "so that we might fulfill the obligation of accepting the true faith and of persevering in it constantly." Thus the duty of guarding the purity and the integrity of the divinely revealed message must be reckoned as one of the highest prerogatives of the men whom God has commissioned to rule over His Church. The work of defending and clarifying the deposit of divine revelation for the entire Church of God is, therefore, an outstanding privilege and duty of Christ's Vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff.

A glance through the table of contents of Denzinger's *Enchiridion symbolorum* or through the index of Cavallera's *Thesaurus doctrinae catholicae* is sufficient to show that a great number among the successors of St. Peter have discharged their high obligation in this respect by condemning errors contradictory to or incompatible with divine public revelation and by presenting their teachings on these points in pronouncements which have become classical sources of Catholic theology. Three Pontiffs of the past century, however, have been privileged to draw up, or, to put it in another way, have been faced with the duty of drawing up, a rather formidable list of errors which have seriously affected the faithful of their own generations.

In his encyclical *Quanta cura,* and in the *Errorum syllabus* attached to it, the great Pius IX stigmatized the doctrinal aberrations that threatened the faith of the people of his own time.[1] Forty-three years later the saintly Pius X issued his encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis,* indicating and condemning the complexus of heresies and errors which we know by the name of Modernism.[2] Some of these same misstatements and misconceptions of Christian doctrine had been listed and reproved only a few weeks previously in the decree *Lamentabili sane exitu,* issued by the Holy Office.[3] Three years after the appearance of the *Pascendi dominici gregis,*

---

[1] This encyclical was dated Dec. 8, 1864.

[2] Sept. 8, 1907.

[3] July 3, 1907.

Pius X sent out his *Motu proprio,* the *Sacrorum antistitum neminem,* in which he warned against the continuing efforts against the Church and made the oath against the errors of Modernism incumbent upon seven different groups of churchmen.[4]

Our own beloved Pius XII, just three months ago, found it necessary to make another collection of errors and to reprove these errors in the encyclical *Humani generis.*[5] By a remarkable coincidence, the *Humani generis* was issued forty-three years after the *Pascendi,* just as this latter document appeared forty-three years after the *Quanta cura* and the *Syllabus.* Actually it would not be too much to say that these three pronouncements, spanning a period of eighty-six years, deal with three distinct manifestations of the same tendency, or the same type of disloyalty to the Catholic Church and the Catholic faith. In each case the Sovereign Pontiffs have had to deal with errors professed by Catholics who have had more confidence in the spirit and the intellectual tendencies of the world, especially the world of intellectual fashion, than they have had in the truth of Jesus Christ. In the case of the *Humani generis,* the Holy Father has likewise been called upon to condemn the errors of men who have been led astray by an imprudent and unenlightened desire for religious concord and unity.

In the very heading of the present encyclical, the Holy Father announces that he is going to treat of "certain false opinions that threaten to undermine the foundations of Catholic doctrine." The issue of the *Osservatore Romano* which carries the document in its original Latin text and in its Italian translation states in its headline that "the Supreme Pontiff reproves certain false opinions and tendencies that threaten to lessen the integrity of Catholic doctrine." The Holy Father himself, in the brief pastoral section which comes towards the end of the encyclical, speaks of errors which he has reproved and of norms which he has enjoined in the *Humani generis.* And, when we examine the encyclical itself, we find that it deals primarily with doctrinal errors current in our own day, but we learn also that it explains the various tendencies with which these errors are connected, and gives the standards for accurate and loyal Catholic teaching on the portions of Catholic truth which have been misrepresented by the contemporary writers whose aberrations have called forth the denunciation of Christ's vicar on earth.

---

[4] Sept. 1, 1910.

[5] This encyclical was dated Aug. 12, 1950. It first appeared in the *Osservatore Romano* in the Aug. 21 number.

The *Humani generis* is one of those documents which must be analyzed very carefully if their full meaning is to be appreciated. The document is magnificently ordered and arranged, and yet its schematic form, the very thing which must be grasped if the message itself is to be completely understood, is somewhat obscured under the literary perfection of the *stylus curiae* so characteristic of all papal encyclicals. For those who study the document in an unannotated translation, the work of analysis will probably be somewhat difficult.

The body of the encyclical is divided into two main parts, a long doctrinal section (nn. 1-39), and a brief pastoral section (nn. 40-43). The doctrinal part consists of five main divisions. The first of these (nn. 1-8), after insisting upon the evil of religious error and discord and error in general, goes on to deal with the occasions and the classifications of errors current among non-Catholics in our own time. The remaining four treat of false opinions that have gained adherents within the Catholic Church itself.

The second section (nn. 9-13), speaks about the fact, the motivation, and the basic errors to be found among the statements of some Catholic writers of our day, and of the various degrees or levels of opposition to Catholic truth to be encountered among the pronouncements issued by this group. The third section (nn. 14-28), is concerned with individual errors in the field of sacred theology. The fourth (nn. 29-34), is devoted to false teachings within the domain of philosophy. The fifth (nn. 34-39), describes and corrects certain aberrations connected with the matter of the positive sciences.

ERRONEOUS RELIGIOUS TEACHINGS OUTSIDE THE CHURCH

The first paragraph contains the introduction to and the guiding theme of the entire encyclical, the statement that discord and error among men on moral and religious matters have ever been the cause of most profound sorrow to all good people, but especially to the faithful and loyal children of the Church, particularly today, when we see the principles of Christian culture being attacked on all sides. It thus disposes, of course, of the opinion occasionally voiced in some ill-enlightened sources not too long ago, an opinion to the effect that at least in a democracy, diversity of religion was something desirable.

The remainder of this section, dealing with errors about religion prevalent in non-Catholic circles, is subdivided into two parts. The first of these deals with factors that contribute towards false teachings about religion among those who are not members of the Church. Some of these factors, those described in the second paragraph, tend to hold a man back from the acquisition of naturally ascertainable information about God and about the natural law. The force of the senses and of the imagination and evil passions arising from original sin combine to render the gaining of this knowledge difficult. The third paragraph reminds the reader of the encyclical that these factors are what render divine supernatural revelation morally necessary that, in the present condition of the human race, religious and moral truths of the natural order can be known by all, readily, with firm certitude, and with no admixture of error. The Holy Father has employed a formula previously used in the Vatican Council's constitution *Dei Filius*. But where the Council had spoken of God's supernatural revelation as thus requisite that a natural knowledge about God might be obtained, the *Humani generis* describes it as necessary for the acquisition of natural truth in the fields of religion and of morals.

Another part of this first section, the fourth paragraph, lists certain influences that tend to hinder a man from recognizing the powerful objective evidence in favor of the Catholic faith's credibility, and which move him to reject and resist the graces God offers him to bring him to the faith. Prejudiced opinions, the passions, and ill will are listed as factors operating in this direction.

The second portion of the section dealing with errors prevalent outside the true Church classifies these false teachings under four headings. First it lists the opinion that the system of evolution, which, incidentally, the encyclical describes as not completely proven even in the domain of the natural sciences, can explain the origin of all things. The Holy Father adds that the people who adopt this opinion show favor to the monistic and pantheistic notion that the whole world is in a process of continual evolution. He notes also that the Communists gladly make use of this opinion to propound and to exalt their dialectical materialism in the minds of those who have been deprived of all idea of a personal God by reason of their acceptance of this "evolutionism."

Next, the *Humani generis* mentions the new and erroneous philosophy of existentialism, which ignores the immutable essences of things and is concerned only with the existence of individuals. In the third place it speaks of a certain "historicism," which, being concerned solely with the events of human life, completely ruins the foundations of any absolute truth and law, in either the natural or the supernatural order.

The fourth and final way of error mentioned in this section of the encyclical is that of non-Catholics who are simultaneously enthusiastic for the Bible and hostile to human reason and who are contemptuous of the Church's teaching power while they delightedly praise the authority of God as the Author of revelation.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS ERRORS PROPOUNDED BY SOME CATHOLIC TEACHERS

This part of the encyclical deals with the correct attitude on the part of Catholic writers towards the errors mentioned in the previous section, with the twofold motivation underlying the false opinions propounded by some Catholic teachers, and with the various ways in which these opinions are put forward. The Holy Father teaches that it is the duty of Catholic theologians and philosophers to study the false opinions on religion and morality current in the present-day world. They are bound to this study since they cannot fulfill their obligation to work for truth among men unless they understand the intellectual evils by which their fellows are affected. The encyclical also reminds them that quite often there is a certain amount of truth hidden in these contemporary errors, and insists upon the fact that the proper study of these errors will bring about a more careful consideration of known theological and philosophical truths.

Dealing with the motives that underlie recent aberrations among Catholic teachers, the *Humani generis* insists that some of these men have been led astray by an over-eagerness for new things and also by a fear that they might be considered ignorant of recent scientific advances. These individuals, the Holy Father tells us, are trying to withdraw themselves from the control of the sacred teaching authority. There is a danger that they may gradually depart from revealed truth and draw others along with them into error.

Other proponents of false opinions, the encyclical tells us, have been motivated by a desire to break down the barriers that divide good and honest men so as to bring about more readily the incorporation of men of every culture and religious opinion within Christ's kingdom. Unfortunately these individuals seek to reconcile dogmatic differences, and they desire that the theology and the theological methods which have been taught in our schools with the approval of the ecclesiastical authority itself should not only be perfected, but completely reshaped. The Holy Father likens their attitude towards theology and the theological methods to that of certain Modernists with respect to the Church's traditional apologetics.

The Church, according to the encyclical, definitely does not object to any efforts directed towards advancing or perfecting the theological sciences. What it does reprove in these proponents of a false "irenicism" is their contention that things founded on laws and principles given by Our Lord, or on institutions brought into being by Him—things that actually constitute the defense and the support of the integrity of the faith, should be regarded as obstacles standing in the way of work for Christian unity. The Holy Father reminds us that any unity brought about by the repudiation of these factors would involve the ruin of those unfortunate enough to enter into it.

The encyclical then goes on to assert, in the final paragraph of this section, that these errors, whether motivated by desire of novelty or by a false zeal for souls, are not always brought forward to the same degree of insistence or with the same degree of clarity, nor presented in the same terms, nor advocated unanimously by all the writers of the movement. The language of the *Humani generis* here shows clearly that the Holy Father has a definite and fairly coherent group in mind.

He tells us that some of these men advance their opinions cautiously and employ distinctions in such a way as to cover up their real meanings, while others come along afterwards and propose these same views openly and without moderation. We are told that the unabashed presentation of these erroneous views has brought harm to the younger clergy and that it has been detrimental to the Church's teaching authority. The encyclical goes on to insist that opinions which have been taught in covert fashion in printed works have been put forth with less restraint in writings destined for private circulation and in conferences and lectures. Such opinions have been circulated, not only in seminaries and in religious houses, but also among the laity, especially those engaged in the work of education.

This thirteenth paragraph of the encyclical is extremely interesting from the point of view of recent theological history. The Holy Father makes it clear that the same general group, although not necessarily the same individuals, have taught basically the same opinions, more circumspectly in published writings and more openly in documents intended for private circulation. Both Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange and Fr. Labourdette, the former in his well known article, "La nouvelle theologie, ou va-t-elle?" and the latter in his *Dialogue théologique* have mentioned such writings. A great deal of the shameful vituperation heaped on Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange by writers who should have been above this procedure was due to his discussion of such unpublished material in connection with his critique of published writings.

ERRORS AND NORMS IN THE FIELD OF SACRED THEOLOGY

The division of the encyclical dealing with false opinions in the field of theology is divided into four sub-sections. The first of these deals with errors concerning the terminology and the concepts employed in Catholic dogma and in sacred theology, and with the standards by which Catholic teaching on these subjects is to governed. The second treats of errors with respect to the Church's teaching office and lists the pertinent standards for teaching. The third lists errors about the authority of the Scriptures, while the fourth contains a list of individual errors that result from the basic misconceptions mentioned in the first three subsections.

Those who have gone astray in this first field are men who advise minimizing the meaning of dogma as much as possible and who wish to free dogma from the mode of expression long established in the Church and from philosophical concepts held in esteem by Catholic teachers. They intend to replace the terminology now in use with that employed by the Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church in the explanation of Catholic doctrine. These people, according to the encyclical, regard the terminology and the concepts to which they object as extrinsic to divine revelation. The Holy Father goes on to tie up this erroneous tendency with the twofold motivation of which he spoke in the previous portion of the *Humani generis.* Those who seek the replacement of the Church's traditional terminology and of the various philosophical concepts now in use in expounding God's message hope by this means to bring about ultimately a mutual assimilation of Catholic dogma and the tenets of the dissidents. At the same time they expect thus to be able to satisfy what they consider modern needs by expressing Catholic dogma in the terms and the concepts of such contemporary philosophies as those of "immanentism," "idealism," or "existentialism."

The encyclical then indicates a second and a worse basic error in this field. There are some bolder spirits, it informs us, who hold that dogma can and ought to be presented clothed with the terminology and the concepts of these false philosophies because, they contend, the mysteries of the faith can never be expressed by adequately true concepts, but only by notions which they call "approximative," notions which serve to a certain extent to disclose the truth, but which, at the same time, necessarily distort it. Hence they believe that theology, utilizing various forms through the course of the ages, can and must substitute new notions for old ones, so that it may make the same divine truths available to men in different ways, and even in ways that are to some extent opposed to one another, but which remain, as they put it, equivalent. Such individuals maintain that the history of dogma is the record of these various successive forms, differing according to the various philosophies and opinions that have come into being during the course of the centuries, forms in which revealed truth has been clothed.

The next two paragraphs deal with norms pertinent to these errors. The *Humani generis* declares that this second error actually embodies what is known as dogmatic "relativism," and that the contempt for traditional teaching and for traditional terminology in which the Church's doctrine is expressed tends effectively in that same direction. The encyclical insists that the terminology employed in the schools and in the Church's own teaching office can be perfected. Furthermore, we are told that it is common knowledge that the Church itself has not always used the same words in exactly the same way.

The *Humani generis* speaks out very clearly on the subject of the Church's relation to various philosophies which have flourished during its own history. It insists that the Church is in no way bound up with the various and ephemeral systems of thought which have attracted attention for a little while. At the same time it teaches that words and concepts composed and elaborated through common effort by Catholic teachers during the course of many centuries to bring about some understanding of dogma are by no means based upon any such faulty foundation as that of an evanescent philosophy. It teaches that the works of these men are based upon principles and concepts deduced from an accurate knowledge of created reality, and confirmed by the revealed truth proposed by the Church. Hence, the Holy Father assures us, some of these notions have been used and even sanctioned by oecumenical councils, in such a way that it is wrong (*nefas*) to depart from them.

To neglect such notions and concepts, or to attempt to reject them or to deprive them of their value, the *Humani generis* censures as supremely imprudent and as a tentative to represent Catholic dogma itself as something subject to change. The current contempt for notions and terms regularly employed by scholastic theologians is designated as something which tends to weaken speculative theology, a discipline which the erring Catholic teachers consider incapable of generating genuine certitude because it employs the *ratio theologica*.

The second sub-section of that portion of the encyclical devoted to contemporary false opinions in the field of sacred theology deals with the teaching office of the Church itself. The Holy Father complains that the men who are avid for novelties pass easily from a contempt for scholastic theology to a neglect or even a contempt for the teaching authority of the Church, which supports scholastic theology. In general these errant teachers are said to look upon the Church's *magisterium* as a hindrance to progress and as an obstacle standing in the way of science. Here the *Humani generis* takes cognizance of an opinion current among some non-Catholics, a belief that the Church's teaching authority is an unjust restraining factor, preventing some qualified theologians from reforming their own subject. This juxtaposition of opinions is calculated to show that these unfortunate Catholic teachers have, in effect, adopted a characteristically non-Catholic attitude towards the *ecclesia docens*.

The Holy Father states that these teachers sometimes treat the obligation of complete adherence to the Church's *magisterium* as if it were non-existent, despite the fact that this teaching agency has been constituted as the proximate and universal norm of truth for all theologians. The Holy Father reminds his readers that Our Lord has entrusted the entire deposit of faith, including both Scripture and tradition, to the Church, so that the Church may guard, preserve, and explain it. The faithful are strictly obligated to avoid errors that more or less approach the gravity of heresy, and to obey the various constitutions and decrees in which such evil opinions are proscribed and forbidden by the Holy See.

Specifically the Holy Father reproves the conduct of some men who deliberately and habitually neglect what the Popes have taught in their encyclicals about the nature and the constitution of the Church in order that a kind of vague notion which they say they have drawn from the Fathers, especially from the Greek Fathers, may prevail. These individuals claim that the Pontiffs do not wish to pass judgment on matters disputed among theologians. Consequently, they believe, we should go back to the earliest sources, and from these writings of the ancients explain what the *magisterium* of the Church has taught in more recent times.

The *Humani generis* then proceeds to give the norms which should govern Catholic teaching on the matters mentioned in this series of errors, errors which it describes as cleverly stated, but still fallacious. First of all, it insists that, despite the fact that generally speaking the Pontiffs allow freedom of discussion on points disputed among better-known theologians, history teaches us that several issues which were once subject to discussion are now no longer open to question.

Then, passing on to the teaching about the doctrinal import of the papal encyclicals, the Holy Father tells us that it is a mistake to withhold assent from doctrines proposed in these documents on the pretense that the Pope does not exercise his supreme teaching power in the encyclicals. These letters demand assent of themselves. Things taught in them are proposed in the ordinary *magisterium,* in which, just as truly as in the solemn judgments of the Church, Our Lord's promise set forth in the Gospel according to St. Luke, the promise that the man who accepts the Church's teaching actually accepts His doctrine,[6] is verified. The *Humani generis* presents as a general norm to cover teaching on this point the statement that, when the Holy Father gives his decision on any subject which has hitherto been subject to controversy, his judgment is no longer open to question among theologians.

---

[6] Cf. *Luke* 10:16.

Since the errors about the Church's teaching office involved mention of the sources of revelation, the encyclical sets forth certain norms which are to regulate their use. It informs us that it is definitely the business of the theologian to have recourse to Scripture and to tradition, since it is his duty to show how the truths set forth in the Church's living *magisterium* are actually to be found, either implicitly or explicitly, in these very sources. Then it goes on to show that an insistence upon this function in no way closes the door upon the possibility of definite progress in theology. Such progress is made possible by reason of the inexhaustible wealth of truth contained in the sources themselves.

The Holy Father assures us that positive theology is definitely not to be considered as something on the same plane with merely historical science, since God has given His Church both the sources of revelation and the sacred *magisterium* and has commissioned this latter to elucidate and explain what is contained only obscurely and as it were implicitly in the deposit of faith. The encyclical reiterates the truth that the power to expound the deposit of faith authentically was given by Our Lord, not to all the faithful nor to the theologians themselves, but only to the Church's *magisterium*. Since the Church has used this power time and time again throughout the centuries in both the ordinary and extraordinary exercise of its authority, we are told that the method of explaining these clear statements through an appeal to obscure sources must evidently be considered as entirely false. Exactly the opposite procedure should be adopted. This paragraph of the encyclical ends with a citation of the great Pius IX, to the effect the noblest task of the theologian is that of showing how the doctrines defined by the Church are actually contained in the sources of revelation in the very sense in which they have been defined by the Church.

The third sub-section of this portion of the encyclical deals with contemporary errors that are derogatory to the divine authority of Sacred Scripture. The first of these aberrations consists in a perversion of the doctrine that God is the Author of these books. The second is a renewal of the old false teaching that the infallibility of Sacred Scripture extends only to its statements about God, about morals, and about religion. Another is the teaching that there is a human sense of Scripture, under which a divine sense, the only infallible sense or meaning according to these mistaken teachers, lies concealed.

A fourth error is to be found in the tendency of some writers to take no cognizance of the analogy of faith or of the Church's tradition in interpreting Scripture. Such individuals hold that a merely human or independent interpretation of the Scriptures constitutes the norm by which the teaching of the Church's *magisterium* and that of the Fathers is to be evaluated. Actually Sacred Scripture must be interpreted according to the mind of the Church.

The last mistake about the interpretation of the Bible stigmatized in this part of the encyclical is that of men who wish to replace the traditional literal sense of the sacred books by a sort of exegesis they call symbolical and spiritual. They hope, in this way, to make the Old Testament, which they consider a "closed fountain" in the Church at present, eventually available to all. They claim, moreover, that all the difficulties against the Bible, difficulties they believe to be connected with the literal sense of Scripture, will vanish once the literal sense has been discarded.

The encyclical does not give any series of norms governing the matter covered by these errors about Scripture and its interpretation. It simply points to the fact that all of them are in manifest opposition to the teachings contained in Pope Leo's *Providentissimus,* Pope Benedict's *Spiritus Paraclitus,* and the present Holy Father's *Divino afflante Spiritu.*

The fourth and final sub-section of this part of the encyclical lists some individual errors as "poisonous fruits" of the false teachings and tendencies already described. The Holy Father explicitly mentions and condemns the following.

a) Doubt that human reason, without the help of divine revelation and of divine grace, can demonstrate the existence of a personal God by means of arguments deduced from created things.

b) A denial that the world had a beginning.

c) The statement that the creation of the world was necessary.

d) The denial that God has an eternal and infallible foreknowledge of man's free actions.

e) A belief that the doctrine according to which angels are creatures endowed with personality is open to question.

f) Admission of the hypothesis that there is no essential difference between matter and spirit.

g) A perversion of the Catholic teaching on the gratuity of the supernatural order, based on the assumption that God cannot create a creature endowed with intelligence without ordering and calling that creature to the beatific vision.

h) A corruption of Catholic teaching about the concept and the definitions of original sin, of sin in general as an offense against God, and of the satisfaction Christ made for us. On all of these points the Tridentine definitions have been neglected by the men who are guilty of this faulty teaching.

i) A teaching that the doctrine of transubstantiation, as something based upon an outmoded philosophical concept of substance, ought to be revised in such a way that Our Lord's Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament would be reduced to a kind of symbolism, according to which the consecrated species would merely be efficacious signs of Our Lord's spiritual presence and of His intimate union with the faithful members in the Mystical Body.

j) An opinion that men are not bound by the teaching contained in the *Mystici Corporis* and based upon the sources of revelation, the teaching to the effect that Christ's Mystical Body and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing. In the light of this decision of the *Humani generis*, incidentally, it would henceforth be erroneous to deny that the *Mystici Corporis* had taught that the Catholic Church is actually the Mystical Body.

k) A teaching which reduces the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to attain eternal salvation to an empty formula.

l) A minimizing of the rational character of the credibility of the Christian faith.

The final paragraph in this part of the encyclical declares that manifestly these and other evils have crept in among some of the children of the Church who have been led astray by a false zeal for souls and by pseudo-science. The Holy Father states that he has been compelled to point out these errors and dangers of error, and that he has acted "not without anxiety."

ERRORS AND NORMS IN THE FIELD OF PHILOSOPHY

The fourth part of the doctrinal section of this encyclical opens with a series of general norms for Catholic teaching about this science. It then considers two sets of errors, appending after each list the pertinent individual standards for correct presentation of Catholic truth on this subject. Finally it speaks of the fruits of these errors and of the ultimate sources of the intellectual evils reproved in this section of the papal letter.

The first paragraph of this part sets forth the Catholic teaching about the competence of the human mind, the need of a true philosophy for the proper operation of the human mind in matters of faith and morals, and the characteristics of this true philosophy. The Catholic Church teaches that human reason is capable of demonstrating with certainty the existence of the one personal God, that it can build up an incontrovertible proof of the foundations of the Christian faith itself from signs given by God, and that it can achieve some understanding and a most fruitful understanding of the mysteries. The *Humani generis* insists, however, that reason can accomplish these functions fittingly and safely only when it is properly trained, or in possession of the sane and traditional philosophy, a system of thought which has stood up under the test of divine revelation, proposed by the infallible *magisterium* of the Church. This philosophy is described as one which protects the true and sincere value of human knowledge, proclaims the basic metaphysical principles of sufficient reason, causality and of finality, and teaches that certain and immutable truth can be known.

The encyclical acknowledges that there are points in even this traditional philosophy which have no connection with truths of faith and morals, and which, as a result, the Church leaves free for discussion. It reminds its readers, however, that this same freedom does not obtain throughout the entire extent of philosophy, and that this is true particularly where its basic teachings are concerned. Even with respect to such basic questions, it is definitely permissible to clothe this philosophy in a better form, to endow it with an improved terminology, cautiously to enrich it with elements gained during the advance of human knowledge, and to divest it of some imperfections. It is never allowable, however, to reject it, to contaminate it with false principles, or to pass it over as something obsolete.

The *Humani generis* reminds us that truth and the philosophical expression of truth do not change from day to day, and that this holds particularly in the case of philosophical principles and conclusions that have been confirmed by revelation. God guides the human mind, not so that it may replace one truth by another, but in such a way that it puts aside errors which it may have admitted, and builds upon its foundation of truth. Both philosophers and theologians are urged not to accept blindly every new teaching excogitated in this world, but to subject new ideas to severe and objective criticism, lest they admit some notions that would pervert or destroy the truth they already possess, and damage or ruin their own faith.

The norms already given in this section serve to explain, the encyclical tells us, why the Church, in its Canon Law, insists upon the philosophical training of its candidates for the priesthood *"ad Angelici Doctoris rationem, doctrinam et principia."* The Holy Father tells us that the method and the *ratio* of St. Thomas are outstandingly good for the training of beginners in philosophy and for the investigation of advanced questions, that his doctrine is consonant with divine revelation, most useful for the defense of the faith, and for the effective and secure assimilation of the fruits of genuine intellectual progress.

The Holy Father complains that certain teachers within the Church affect to despise this traditional and recognized philosophy on the pretense that it is outmoded in form and rationalistic in its process of thought. These men err in holding that our philosophy is imperfect because it teaches that an absolutely true metaphysic can exist. They hold, on the contrary, that reality, especially transcendent reality, can best be expressed by disparate doctrines, teachings which are supposed to complete one another, even while they are to a certain extent mutually opposed. These same individuals, in short, are charged with passing over the systematic philosophy of the Catholic schools as something fitted only to introduce men to the study of scholastic theology, or as something that appealed to the minds of mediaeval men and which has no message or meaning for the men of our own time.

They turn away from the perennial philosophy as something concerned only with unchanging essences, and claim that the contemporary mind necessarily looks towards the existences of individual things, and towards an ever-changing life process. And, while they despise this philosophy, they praise every other kind to the sky, in such a way as to suggest that any sort of philosophy or opinion, with some additions or perhaps corrections, can be reconciled with Catholic dogma. The encyclical offers us as a norm for correct teaching on this point the declaration that some philosophies, particularly those of immanentism, idealism, historical or dialectical materialism, or atheistic or sceptical existentialism, are incompatible with Catholic dogma.

The encyclical then takes cognizance that these teachers sometimes oppose the Church's perennial philosophy on yet another ground, repudiating it as something that treats only of the intellect in explaining the process of cognition, neglecting the function of the will and of the affections. It denounces this attitude as false because the Christian philosophy has never denied the utility and the efficacy of good dispositions of the entire mind for the knowledge and the acceptance of religious and moral truths. As a matter of fact it has actually insisted that the lack of such dispositions explains how an intellect affected by ill will and by passions can be darkened so that it does not grasp truth properly. The Holy Father reminds us of St. Thomas' teaching to the effect that the intellect can be aided in its understanding of higher things belonging to either the natural or the supernatural order by a kind of affective connaturality for these realities, whether this connaturality be something on the level of nature or a gift pertaining to the order of divine grace.

The *Humani generis* reminds us, however, that it is one thing to acknowledge that the disposition of the affections of the will has the power to aid the reason to acquire a more certain and firm cognition of moral truth, and it is quite another thing to attribute, as these innovators do, a sort of intuitive power to the appetitive or affective faculties themselves, or to say that when the intellect has shown itself incapable of deciding what is true in any given case, it turns to the will which makes a free choice in such a manner that cognition and the act of the will are mixed up together in this operation.

The Holy Father states that the false opinions he has listed and discussed endanger two sciences which by their very nature are intimately connected with the doctrine of faith. The men who propound these opinions describe theodicy and ethics as intended, not to prove anything certain about God or about any transcendent reality, but only to show that what faith teaches about the personal God and about His commandments is in harmony with the necessities of life, and that this doctrine must be accepted if men are going to escape despair and attain eternal salvation.

The Holy Father condemns these opinions as obviously contradicting the statements of Leo XIII and Pius X and as incompatible with the teaching of the Vatican Council. He states that this condemnation would not have been necessary if men had paid proper attention to the Church's *magisterium*, which is commissioned and obligated to watch over philosophical teachings at the same time that it is empowered to guard the deposit of divine revelation.

ERRORS IN THE FIELD OF POSITIVE SCIENCE

This portion of the encyclical opens with a statement of general norms. Noting that many persons insist that the Church should take serious cognizance of the teachings of the positive sciences, where these doctrines come into contact with the truths of the faith, the Holy Father designates this insistence as something laudable where it has reference to facts actually demonstrated by these positive disciplines. He reminds us, however, that mere hypotheses set forth in these sciences must be handled with great caution when they touch upon doctrine contained in the sources of divine revelation. Hypotheses that are opposed directly or even indirectly to revealed truth must not be accepted in any way.

The *Humani generis* then deals with individual hypotheses set forth in the name of three positive sciences, biology, anthropology, and history. The first of these hypotheses, put forward in the name of biology and anthropology, is the evolutionistic explanation of the origin of the human body as something which was formed originally from existent and living matter. The Church's *magisterium* allows discussion and investigation about the truth of this theory in the present status of theology and of the positive disciplines by men competent in either field, but allows it under certain conditions. The first condition is that serious consideration should be given to reasons on both sides, those that militate against the hypothesis as well as those that favor it. The second is that men on both sides must be prepared to obey the Church's judgment when it is issued. The Holy Father complains that the freedom of discussion allowed by the Church on this point has been definitely abused by men who conduct themselves as if the origin of the human body from existent and living matter has been established and demonstrated as certain from evidence now at hand and from reasonings already made from that evidence. These individuals likewise abuse the freedom the Church has accorded them when they act as if there were nothing in the content of the sources of revelation that makes great caution on the subject matter of this hypothesis imperative.

At the same time, the encyclical assures us that the origin of the human soul is definitely not open to question. The Catholic faith obligates us to hold that souls are immediately created by God.

Another hypothesis, that of polygenism, is put forward in the name of anthropology. The Holy Father tells us that this must be rejected outright. The faithful cannot accept the doctrine that here on earth after Adam there lived true men who did not derive their origin from him as the first parent of all men by the process of natural generation. They are likewise forbidden to hold that the name "Adam" stands for a group of first parents. There is absolutely no evidence that either of these hypotheses could be reconciled with what the sources of revelation contain and the Church's *magisterium* teaches about original sin. The encyclical reminds us that original sin is something that proceeds from an offense against God actually committed by Adam as an individual person, and that it affects each individual as something which has come to him through the process of generation.

The last two doctrinal paragraphs of the encyclical deal with an erroneous tendency that masks itself under the guise of history. The Holy Father asserts that some men have interpreted the historical books of the Old Testament in entirely too free a manner, and that they have wrongly appealed to a recent letter from the Pontifical Biblical Commission to the Archbishop of Paris in support of their position. This letter, signed by the late Fr. Vosté and addressed to Cardinal Suhard, spoke of the first eleven chapters of the Book of Genesis. The encyclical reminds us of its insistence that, despite the fact that these chapters do not manifest the qualities of historical composition to be found in the works of the outstanding Greek and Latin historians or those manifest in competent historical writings of our own time, they must be classified in some true sense as historical. The letter also reminded the exegetes of their duty to investigate and to determine in just what way these chapters can rightfully lay claim to this designation.

Explaining and employing the terms used in the letter to Cardinal Suhard, the Holy Father brings out the fact that these eleven chapters accomplish a twofold work, using simple and figurative language, adapted to the mentality of a comparatively uncultured people. They set forth the principal truths of the order of salvation and they also give a popular description of the origin of both the human race and of the chosen people.

The *Humani generis* admits the possibility that inspired writers of the Old Testament drew some of their material from non-inspired popular narratives. At the same time it warns its readers not to forget that, in acting thus, these men were aided by the process of divine inspiration, which preserved them from error in their task of selecting and evaluating these documents.

Finally, the encyclical assures us that material taken from popular narratives and incorporated into the inspired writings is definitely not to be put on the same level as myths. The very character of the sacred books of the Old Testament makes it clear that the inspired writers utterly surpass the profane authors of ancient times.

THE SITUATION AND ITS EXIGENCIES

In the brief pastoral portion of the encyclical, the Holy Father describes the reaction of the Catholic academic world to the errors he has treated in the dogmatic part of this document. He then issues certain definite commands and admonitions, demanded by the actual situation, to Bishops, to superiors, and to teachers.

First we are assured that these errors were being taught either in an open or a covert manner when the encyclical was written. Then we are told that the great number of Catholic teachers in various institutions of higher learning have not fallen into these false opinions. The Holy Father realizes that these teachings have the power to attract people who are not cautious. He has preferred to put a stop to them at the outset, rather than to be compelled to administer medicine for a disease that had already become deep-seated.

So it is that to put a stop to these errors, the Holy Father has commanded Bishops and superiors of religious communities to take the most diligent care to prevent such opinions from being advanced in schools, in conferences, or in writings of any kind. They are likewise ordered to see to it that these errors are not taught in any way to the clergy or the faithful. This precept binds them most seriously in conscience.

Teachers in ecclesiastical institutions are warned that they cannot with safe conscience exercise the office of teaching entrusted to them unless they religiously accept and strictly observe the norms the Holy Father has given. They are told that they are obligated to show due reverence and obedience to the Church's *magisterium* themselves and to instill these attitudes into their own pupils.

Catholic teachers are also urged to work towards the progress of the sciences they teach. At the same time, however, they are ordered to do this without violating the rules the Holy Father has laid down in this encyclical for the purpose of guarding the truth of the faith and of Catholic doctrine. They are to investigate the questions that have arisen as a result of the latest scientific advances, but they are to conduct their investigation prudently and cautiously. Finally, they are to avoid all false "irenicism" and remember that those outside the Church can be brought back into it properly and successfully only when the entire truth existing within the Church is delivered honestly to everyone, in all its purity and integrity.

Such are the teachings of the *Humani generis.* The Holy Father has warned us of existent errors, which have endangered the existence and the integrity of the Catholic faith among the men of our own time. These errors have been taught more forcefully in non-published material, but they have been propounded also in books and articles important and powerful enough to make them dangerous for the children of the Church. The encyclical that condemns these false opinions is addressed, not to the hierarchy of any one country, but to all the bishops of the world. It was so addressed only because the Holy Father realized that the errors and tendencies he was called upon to denounce threatened the faith everywhere.

Hence there can be no excuse whatsoever for the tactic of brushing aside the lesson of this encyclical with the statement that it refers to controversies that have aroused no interest and exercised no influence in this part of the world. Such an assertion about the *Humani generis,* made in our own country, would be manifestly false. It would, furthermore, only serve to influence the people for whom this encyclical was written to turn their attention from what is, and what must be considered as, a magnificent and a tremendously important instrument for the preservation and the integrity of the faith in our times.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

MAY A HIGH MASS BE CONSIDERED A PRIVATE MASS?

Question: On the Vigil of Pentecost, a priest who had been singing a High Mass every morning in a convent chapel said only a Low Mass as he had not time to read the prophecies and litanies. Could he not have sung, as usual, a High Mass, beginning with the Introit of the day and omitting the prophecies and litanies?

Answer: The solution of the difficulty proposed above is to be found in the definition of a private Mass since the rubric of the Missal on the Vigil of Pentecost provides that in private Masses on that day the priests begin at once with the Introit omitting the preliminary prophecies and litanies. A private Mass on this vigil would be one apart from the blessing of the font in a parish church or one which is not public in the sense of being a Mass which is not conventual or capitular. *In casu,* the Mass in the convent chapel, unless it were technically a conventual Mass in a community where there was *obligatio chori,* would be considered a private Mass even though it were celebrated *in cantu.* The external solemnity of a High or Solemn Mass would not remove it from the category of private Masses any more than a parochial or a conventual Mass ceases to be a public one if happens to be celebrated as a Low Mass.

Wuest-Mullaney (*Matters Liturgical,* 640) does indeed cite decree No. 2731 of the Congregation of Rites to support his statement that a High Mass may not be celebrated on the Vigil of Pentecost without the prophecies and litanies. The decree in question, however, is a decision, dated August 8, 1835, addressed to a cathedral church in Piedmont, and refers to an annual founded Mass to be celebrated with the attendance of the cathedral chapter and as a Solemn Mass, and decides that this Mass may not be sung without the preliminary prophecies etc. beginning with the Introit *Quum sanctificatus* as for private Masses. Such a Mass, we think, is quite different *quoad solemnitatem intrinsecam* from the private Mass in the convent concerning which the question was raised.

GENUFLECTION RESERVED TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT?

Question: When Mass is celebrated at an altar at which the Blessed Sacrament is not reserved, the priest on coming to the altar and again when about to leave for the sacristy is directed to bow while the server is to genuflect. Would it not be more congruous for both to make the same reverence, namely, a low bow to the cross? We associate the genuflection, at least in this country, as the mark of veneration to be reserved to the Blessed Sacrament.

Answer: Authors generally, though the *Ritus servandus* in the Missal says nothing about it, direct the procedure to which our correspondent calls attention, namely, a bow by the celebrant and a genuflection by the server. However, the preface to our "Baltimore Ceremonial," contains, among various answers given informally by the Congregation of Propaganda concerning ceremonies in the United States, the following: "When the Blessed Sacrament is not kept at the altar where Mass is celebrated, the server on arriving, or when passing before the middle of the altar, should not genuflect, but bow profoundly." Although this direction is contrary to the order detailed in books on ceremonial, it does accord with our American idea that the genuflection is a form of reverence to be paid to the Blessed Sacrament alone. The strict letter of liturgical protocol often prescribes a genuflection in cases where the Blessed Sacrament is not present, for example, to the cross on the high altar, except for the celebrant and prelates, but we can see good reason for reserving the bending of the knee to the Blessed Sacrament only, especially as this distinction has the sanction of our official United States manual of ceremonies.

AMONG, OR AMONGST, WOMEN?

Question: We hear, in the recitation of the "Hail Mary," more usually: "Blessed art thou *among* women," but some priests say: "Blessed are thou *amongst* women." Which is to be considered the correct form?

Answer: The text of the "Hail Mary," in its first section, is taken from the Gospel according to St. Luke, Chapter 1. There we read (verse 28): "Blessed are thou *among* women." Later in the same chapter (verse 42), in connection with the visit of Our Lady to her cousin Elizabeth, the salutation is repeated and again the form is: "Blessed art thou *among* women." The correct preposition is, therefore, among, and not amongst. We have quoted from the Douai version of the New Testament. The Ronald Knox translation likewise gives "among women." It is interesting to note, as a specimen of English, that "among," not "amongst," is found also in the Protestant version known as the King James.

Some old prayer-books, for example, the Vest Pocket Manual, give "Blessed art thou amongst women" in the text of the "Hail Mary" and this, no doubt, is the reason of its being heard at times in the public recitation of the *Ave* by priests at devotions in church. What we mean is that this was the form which was learned by these priests as boys.

FREQUENCY OF PONTIFICATING OF A PROTONOTARY

Question: How often during the year may a Protonotary Apostolic celebrate Mass in pontificals? Is there any reason for restricting this to four times a year?

Answer: The Constitution, *Inter multiplices*, issued by Pope Pius X, on February 21, 1905, regulates the pontifical privileges of protonotaries and other prelates. It contains no restrictions as to the number of times the Protonotary Apostolic *ad instar*, which is the rank of those found in this country, may celebrate in pontificals but it does provide that he may do so only with the consent of the Ordinary. The privilege of wearing pontificals is not to be exercised at a Mass of *Requiem* nor in the Eternal City. Details concerning the degree to which the Solemn Mass of a protonotary resembles the Pontifical Mass of a bishop will be found in the Constitution above referred to. We may remark that the Mass differs little from that celebrated by a priest, except in the wearing of pontifical vestments and the attendance of an assistant priest. (Cf. Nainfa, *Costume of Prelates*, 181; McCloud, *Clerical Dress and Insignia*, 131 ff.)

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

UNPAID ADMISSIONS

Question: Does a person fail against justice if he secures admission, by some manner of subterfuge, into a show, a ball game, etc., without paying? And, supposing that this is a violation of justice, is he bound to restitution?

Answer: A person violates justice when, by some form of subterfuge, he obtains admission without paying to a show, a ball game, etc. Some might argue, it is true, that the management is no worse off because of this person's presence, especially if there are a number of vacant seats, and that consequently no injustice has been done. This, however, is an erroneous conclusion. The person has obtained without making compensation entertainment worth a certain sum of money, provided by the management—and that is a violation of commutative justice. *Per se,* he is bound to make restitution, I say *per se;* because I believe that in certain instances those who are in charge of places of amusement can be reasonably presumed to condone the obligation of restitution. For example, I believe that the owners of a circus can be reasonably presumed to free from the obligation of restitution any small boy who has successfully evaded the watchful attendants and crawled into the tent. The management does, indeed, endeavor to frustrate the efforts of the venturesome youths who essay this traditional American method of gaining admission to the "big top," but I am inclined to think that the circus owners take a sportsmanlike attitude toward this matter, and give up the claim to the payment which *per se* is due to them from the small boy who has succeeded in his attempt to see the show. However, this lenient presumption should not be applied too broadly—for example, to the adult who by subterfuge obtains an unpaid admission to a baseball game.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

MISSION INTENTION

"Freedom and Growth of Catholic Schools" is the Mission Intention for the month of November, 1950.

Analecta

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI
PII
Divina Providentia
PAPAE XII
LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE
AD VENERABILES FRATRES
PATRIARCHAS PRIMATES
ARCHIEPISCOPOS EPISCOPOS
ALIOSQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIOS
PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM
CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES

De nonnullis falsis opinionibus quae catholicae doctrinae fundamenta subruere minantur

PIUS PP. XII
VENERABILES FRATRES
SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM

1. HUMANI GENERIS in rebus religiosis ac moralibus discordia et aberratio a veritate probis omnibus, imprimisque fidelibus sincerisque Ecclesiae filiis, vehementissimi doloris fons et causa semper fuere, praesertim vero hodie, cum ipsa culturae christianae principia undique offensa cernimus.

2. Haud mirum quidem est huiusmodi discordiam et aberrationem extra ovile Christi semper viguisse. Nam licet humana ratio, simpliciter loquendo, veram et certam cognitionem unius Dei personalis, mundum providentia sua tuentis ac gubernantis, necnon naturalis legis a Creatore nostris animis inditae, suis naturalibus viribus ac lumine assequi revera possit, nihilominus non pauca obstant quominus eadem ratio hac sua nativa facultate efficaciter fructuoseque utatur. Quae enim ad Deum pertinent et ad rationes spectant, quae inter homines Deumque intercedunt, veritates sunt rerum sensibilium ordinem omnino transcendentes, quae, cum in vitae actionem inducuntur eamque informant, sui devotionem suique abnegationem postulant. Humanus autem intellectus in talibus veritatibus acquirendis difficultate laborat tum ob sensuum imaginationisque impulsum, tum ob pravas cupiditates ex peccato originali ortas. Quo fit ut homines in rebus huiusmodi libenter sibi suadeant esse falsa vel saltem dubia, quae ipsi nolint esse vera.

3. Quapropter divina "revelatio" moraliter necessaria dicenda est, ut ea, quae in rebus religionis et morum rationi per se impervia non sunt, in praesenti quoque humani generis condicione, ab omnibus expedite, firma certitudine et nullo admixto errore cognosci possint (Conc. Vatic. D. B. 1876, Const. *De Fide cath.* cap. 2, *De revelatione*).

4. Quin immo mens humana difficultates interdum pati potest etiam in certo iudicio "credibilitatis" efformando circa catholicam fidem, quamvis tam multa ac mira signa externa divinitus disposita sint quibus vel solo naturali rationis lumine divina christianae religionis origo certo probari possit. Homo enim sive praeiudicatis ductus opinionibus, sive cupidinibus ac mala voluntate instigatus, non modo externorum signorum evidentiae, quae prostat, sed etiam supernis afflatibus, quos Deus in animos ingerit nostros, renuere ac resistere potest.

5. Cuicumque eos circumspicienti, qui extra ovile Christi sunt, haud difficulter patebunt praecipuae quas viri docti non pauci ingressi sunt viae. Etenim sunt qui evolutionis, ut aiunt, systema, nondum invicte probatum in ipso disciplinarum naturalium ambitu, absque prudentia ac discretione admissum ad omnium rerum originem pertinere contendant, atque audacter indulgeant opinationi monisticae ac pantheisticae mundi universi continuae evolutioni obnoxii. Qua quidem opinatione fautores communismi libenter

fruuntur ut suum "materialismum dialecticum" efficacius propugnent et evehant, omni notione theistica ex animis avulsa.

6. Huiusmodi evolutionis commenta, quibus omne, quod absolutum, firmum, immutabile est, repudiatur, viam straverunt novae aberranti philosophiae, quae cum "idealismo", "immanentismo" ac "pragmatismo" contendens, "existentialismi" nomen nacta est, utpote quae, immutabilibus rerum essentiis posthabitis, de singulorum "exsistentia" tantum sollicita sit.

7. Accedit falsus quidam "historicismus", qui solis humanae vitae eventibus inhaerens, cuiusvis veritatis legisque absolutae fundamenta subvertit, cum ad res philosophicas tum ad christiana etiam dogmata quod attinet.

8. In hac tanta opinionum confusione aliquid solaminis Nobis affert eos cernere, qui a "rationalismi" placitis, quibus olim instituti erant, hodie non raro ad veritatis divinitus patefactae haustus redire cupiunt, ac verbum Dei in Sacra Scriptura asservatum agnoscere ac profiteri, utpote disciplinae sacrae fundamentum. At simul dolendum est haud paucos istorum, quo firmius verbo Dei adhaereant, eo magis humanam rationem adimere, et quo libentius Dei revelantis auctoritatem extollant, eo acrius Ecclesiae Magisterium aspernari, a Christo Domino institutum, ut veritates divinitus revelatas custodiat atque interpretetur. Quod quidem non solum Sacris Litteris aperte contradicit, sed ex ipsa rerum experientia falsum manifestatur. Saepe enim ipsi a vera Ecclesia dissidentes de sua ipsorum in rebus dogmaticis discordia palam conqueruntur, ita ut Magisterii vivi necessitatem fateantur inviti.

9. Iamvero theologis ac philosophis catholicis, quibus grave incumbit munus divinam humanamque veritatem tuendi animisque inserendi hominum, has opinationes plus minusve e recto itinere aberrantes neque ignorare neque neglegere licet. Quin immo ipsi easdem opinationes perspectas habeant oportet, tum quia morbi non apte curantur nisi rite praecogniti fuerint, tum quia nonnumquam in falsis ipsis commentis aliquid veritatis latet, tum denique quia eadem animum provocant ad quasdam veritates, sive philosophicas sive theologicas, sollertius perscrutandas ac perpendendas.

10. Quodsi philosophi ac theologi nostri ex hisce doctrinis, caute perspectis, tantummodo huiuscemodi fructum colligere eniterentur, nulla adesset ratio cur Ecclesiae Magisterium interloqueretur. At-

tamen, quamvis Nobis compertum sit catholicos doctores ab illis erroribus generatim cavere, constat tamen non deesse hodie, quemadmodum apostolicis temporibus, qui rebus novis plus aequo studentes, ac vel etiam metuentes ne earum rerum, quas progredientis aetatis scientia invexerit, ignari habeantur, sacri Magisterii moderationi se subducere contendant ideoque in eo versentur periculo ne sensim sine sensu ab ipsa veritate divinitus revelata discedant aliosque secum in errorem inducant.

11. Immo et aliud observatur periculum idque eo gravius, quo virtutis est specie magis obtectum. Plures enim sunt, qui humani generis discordiam ac mentium confusionem deplorantes, imprudenti animorum studio permoti, impetu quodam moventur atque impenso desiderio flagrant infringendi saepta, quibus probi honestique viri invicem disiunguntur, "irenismum" talem amplectentes ut, quaestionibus missis quae homines separant, non modo respiciant ad irruentem atheismum communibus viribus propulsandum, sed etiam ad opposita in rebus quoque dogmaticis reconcilianda. Et quemadmodum olim fuerunt, qui rogarent num translaticia Ecclesiae apologetica ratio obstaculum constitueret potius quam auxilium ad animos Christo lucrandos, ita hodie non desunt qui eo usque procedere audeant ut serio quaestionem moveant num theologia eiusque methodus, quales in scholis ecclesiastica approbante auctoritate vigent, non modo perficiendae, verum etiam omnino reformandae sint, ut regnum Christi quocumque terrarum, inter homines cuiusvis culturae vel cuiusvis opinionis religiosae efficacius propagetur.

12. Quodsi iidem ad nihil aliud intenderent quam ad disciplinam ecclesiasticam eiusque methodum hodiernis condicionibus ac necessitatibus, nova quadam inducta ratione, aptius accommodandas, nulla fere esset causa timendi; at vero imprudenti aestuantes "irenismo", nonnulli veluti obices ad fraternam unitatem restaurandam ea putare videntur, quae ipsis legibus ac principiis a Christo datis innituntur itemque institutis ab eo conditis, vel quae munimina ac fulcimina exstant integritatis fidei, quibus collapsis, omnia uniuntur quidem, sed solummodo in ruinam.

13. Novae huiusmodi opiniones, sive improbando novitatis desiderio, sive laudabili causa moveantur, non semper eodem gradu, eadem claritate iisdemque terminis proponuntur, nec semper unanimo auctorum consensu; quae enim hodie a quibusdam, cautelis nonnullis ac distinctionibus adhibitis, magis tecte docentur, cras ab aliis audacioribus palam atque immoderate proponentur, non

sine multorum offensione, praesertim iunioris cleri, nec sine ecclesiasticae auctoritatis detrimento. Quodsi cautius agi solet in libris publice editis, iam liberius disseritur in libellis privatim communicatis et in acroasibus coetibusque. Nec tantum inter sodales utriusque cleri et in sacris seminariis institutisque religiosis tales opiniones divulgantur, sed etiam inter laicos, inter eos praesertim, qui iuventuti instituendae operam navant.

14. Quod autem ad theologiam spectat, quorumdam consilium est dogmatum significationem quam maxime extenuare; ipsumque dogma a loquendi ratione in Ecclesia iamdiu recepta et a philosophicis notionibus penes catholicos doctores vigentibus liberare, ut in catholica exponenda doctrina ad Sacrae Scripturae sanctorumque Patrum dicendi modum redeatur. Spem ipsi fovent fore ut dogma elementis denudatum, quae extrinsecus a divina revelatione esse dicunt, fructuose comparetur cum eorum opinionibus dogmaticis, qui ab Ecclesiae unitate seiuncti sint, utque hac via pedetemptim perveniatur ad assimilanda sibi invicem dogma catholicum et placita dissidentium.

15. Accedit quod, catholica doctrina ad hanc redacta condicionem, viam sterni autumant, qua, hodiernis necessitatibus satisfaciendo, hodiernae etiam philosophiae notionibus dogma exprimi possit, sive "immanentismi" sive "idealismi" sive "exsistentialismi" aliusve systematis. Quod idcirco etiam fieri posse ac debere audaciores quidam affirmant, quia fidei mysteria numquam notionibus adaequate veris significari posse contendunt, sed tantum notionibus "approximativis", ut aiunt, ac semper mutabilibus, quibus veritas aliquatenus quidem indicetur, sed necessario quoque deformetur. Quapropter non absurdum esse putant, sed necesse omnino esse ut theologia pro variis philosophiis, quibus decursu temporum tamquam suis utitur instrumentis, novas antiquis substituat notiones, ita ut diversis quidem modis, ac vel etiam aliqua ratione oppositis, idem tamen, ut aiunt, valentibus, easdem divinas veritates humanitus reddat. Addunt etiam historiam dogmatum consistere in reddendis variis sibique succedentibus formis, quas veritas revelata induerit, secundum diversas doctrinas et opinationes quae saeculorum decursu ortae fuerint.

16. Patet autem ex iis, quae diximus, huiusmodi molimina non tantum ducere ad "relativismum" dogmaticum, quem vocant, sed illum iam reapse continere; cui quidem despectus doctrinae com-

muniter traditae eorumque vocabulorum, quibus eadem significatur, satis superque favet. Nemo sane est qui non videat huiusmodi notionum vocabula cum in scholis tum ab ipsius Ecclesiae Magisterio adhibita, perfici et perpoliri posse; ac notum praeterea est Ecclesiam in iisdem vocibus adhibendis non semper constantem fuisse. Liquet etiam Ecclesiam non cuilibet systemati philosophico, brevi temporis spatio vigenti, devinciri posse: sed ea quae communi consensu a catholicis doctoribus composita per plura saecula fuere ad aliquam dogmatis intelligentiam attingendam, tam caduco fundamento procul dubio non nituntur. Nituntur enim principiis ac notionibus ex vera rerum creatarum cognitione deductis; in quibus quidem deducendis cognitionibus humanae menti veritas divinitus revelata, quasi stella, per Ecclesiam illuxit. Quare mirum non est aliquas huiusmodi notiones a Conciliis Oecumenicis non solum adhibitas, sed etiam sancitas esse, ita ut ab eis discedere nefas sit.

17. Quapropter neglegere, vel reicere, vel suo valore privare tot ac tanta, quae pluries saeculari labore a viris non communis ingenii ac sanctitatis, invigilante sacro Magisterio, nec sine Sancti Spiritus lumine et ductu, ad accuratius in dies fidei veritates exprimendas mente concepta, expressa ac perpolita sunt, ut eorumdem in locum coniecturales notiones sufficiantur ac quaedam fluxae ac vagae novae philosophiae dictiones, quae ut flos agri hodie sunt et cras decident, non modo summa est imprudentia, verum etiam ipsum dogma facit quasi arundinem vento agitatam. Despectus autem vocabulorum ac notionum quibus theologi scholastici uti solent, sponte ducit ad enervandam theologiam, ut aiunt speculativam, quam, cum ratione theologica innitatur, vera certitudine carere existimant.

18. Utique, proh dolor, rerum novarum studiosi a scholasticae theologiae contemptu ad neglegendum, ac vel etiam ad despiciendum facile transeunt ipsum Magisterium Ecclesiae, quod theologiam illam sua auctoritate tantopere comprobat. Hoc enim Magisterium ab ipsis tamquam progressionis sufflamen ac scientiae obex exhibetur; ab acatholicis vero quibusdam iam veluti iniustum frenum consideratur quo excultiores aliqui theologi a disciplina sua innovanda detineantur. Et quamquam hoc sacrum Magisterium, in rebus fidei et morum, cuilibet theologo proxima et universalis veritatis norma esse debet, utpote cui Christus Dominus totum depositum fidei—Sacras nempe Litteras ac divinam "traditionem" —et custodiendum et tuendum et interpretandum concredidit, at-

tamen officium, quo fideles tenentur illos quoque fugere errores, qui ad haeresim plus minusve accedant, ideoque "etiam constitutiones et decreta servare, quibus pravae huiusmodi opiniones a Sancta Sede proscriptae et prohibitae sunt" (*C. I. C.* can. 1324; cfr. Conc. Vat. D. B. 1820, Const. *De Fide cath.* cap. 4, *De fide et ratione,* post canones), nonnumquam ita ignoratur ac si non habeatur. Quae in Romanorum Pontificum Encyclicis Litteris de indole et constitutione Ecclesiae exponuntur, a quibusdam consulto neglegi solent, ea quidem de causa ut praevaleat notio quaedam vaga, quam ex antiquis Patribus, praesertim graecis, haustam esse profitentur. Pontifices enim, ut ipsi dictitant, de his quae inter theologos disputantur iudicare nolunt, itaque ad pristinos fontes redeundum est et ex antiquorum scriptis recentiora Magisterii constitutiones ac decreta explicanda sunt.

19. Quae etsi fortasse scite dicta videntur, attamen fallacia non carent. Verum namque est generatim Pontifices theologis libertatem concedere in iis quae inter melioris notae doctores vario sensu disputentur; at historia docet, plura quae prius liberae disceptationi subiecta fuerint, postea nullam iam disceptationem pati posse.

20. Neque putandum est, ea quae in Encyclicis Litteris proponuntur, assensum per se non postulare, cum in iis Pontifices supremam sui Magisterii potestatem non exerceant. Magisterio enim ordinario haec docentur, de quo illud etiam valet: "Qui vos audit, me audit" (*Luc.* 10, 16) ; ac plerumque quae in Encyclicis Litteris proponuntur et inculcantur, iam aliunde ad doctrinam catholicam pertinent. Quodsi Summi Pontifices in actis suis de re hactenus controversa data opera sententiam ferunt, omnibus patet rem illam, secundum mentem ac voluntatem eorumdem Pontificum quaestionem liberae inter theologos disceptationis iam haberi non posse.

21. Verum quoque est, theologis semper redeundum esse ad divinae revelationis fontes: eorum enim est indicare qua ratione ea quae a vivo Magisterio docentur, in Sacris Litteris et in divina "traditione", "sive explicite, sive implicite inveniantur" (Pius IX, *Inter gravissimas,* 28 oct. 1870, *Acta,* vol. I, p. 260). Accedit quod uterque doctrinae divinitus revelatae fons tot tantosque continet thesauros veritatis, ut numquam reapse exhauriatur. Quapropter sacrorum fontium studio sacrae disciplinae semper iuvenescunt; dum contra speculatio, quae ulteriorem sacri depositi inquisitionem neglegit, ut experiundo novimus, sterilis evadit. Sed hac de causa theologia etiam positiva, quam dicunt, scientiae dumtaxat histori-

cae aequari nequit. Una enim cum sacris eiusmodi fontibus Deus Ecclesiae suae Magisterium vivum dedit, ad ea quoque illustranda et enucleanda, quae in fidei depositio nonnisi obscure ac velut implicite continentur. Quod quidem depositum nec singulis christifidelibus nec ipsis theologis divinus Redemptor concredidit authentice interpretandum, sed soli Ecclesiae Magisterio. Si autem hoc suum munus Ecclesia exercet, sicut saeculorum decursu saepenumero factum est, sive ordinario sive extraordinario eiusdem muneris exercitio, patet omnino falsam esse methodum, qua ex obscuris clara explicentur, quin immo contrarium omnes sequi ordinem necesse esse. Quare Decessor Noster imm. mem. Pius IX, docens nobilissimum theologiae munus illud esse, quod ostendat quomodo ab Ecclesia definita doctrina contineatur in fontibus, non absque gravi causa illa addidit verba: "eo ipso sensu, quo ab Ecclesia definita est".

22. Ut autem ad novas, quas supra attigimus, opinationes redeamus, plura etiam a nonnullis proponuntur vel mentibus instillantur in detrimentum divinae auctoritatis Sacrae Scripturae. Etenim sensum definitionis Concilii Vaticani de Deo Sacrae Scripturae auctore audacter quidam pervertunt; atque sententiam, iam pluries reprobatam, renovant, secundum quam Sacrarum Litterarum immunitas errorum ad ea solummodo, quae de Deo ac de rebus moralibus et religiosis traduntur, pertineat. Immo perperam loquuntur de sensu humano Sacrorum Librorum sub quo sensus eorum divinus lateat, quem solum infallibilem declarant. In Sacra Scriptura interpretanda nullam haberi volunt rationem analogiae fidei ac "traditionis", Ecclesiae; ita ut Sanctorum Patrum et sacri Magisterii doctrina quasi ad trutinam Sacrae Scripturae, ratione mere humana ab exegetis explicatae, sit revocanda, potius quam eadem Sacra Scriptura exponenda sit ad mentem Ecclesiae, quae a Christo Domino totius depositi veritatis divinitus revelatae custos ac interpres constituta est.

23. Ac praeterea sensus litteralis Sacrae Scripturae eiusque expositio a tot tantisque exegetis, vigilante Ecclesia, elaborata, ex commenticiis eorum placitis, novae cedere debent exegesi, quam symbolicam ac spiritualem appellant; et qua Sacra Biblia Veteris Testamenti, quae hodie in Ecclesia tamquam fons clausus lateant, tandem aliquando omnibus aperiantur. Hac ratione asseverant difficultates omnes evanescere, quibus ii tantummodo praepediantur, qui sensui litterali Scripturarum adhaereant.

24. Quae quidem omnia quam aliena sint a principiis ac normis hermeneuticis a Decessoribus Nostris fel. rec. Leone XIII in Encyclicis Litteris *Providentissimus,* et a Benedicto XV in Enc. Litt. *Spiritus Paraclitus,* itemque a Nobis ipsis in Enc. Litt. *Divino afflante Spiritu* rite statutis nemo est qui non videat.

25. Ac mirum non est huiusmodi novitates, ad omnes fere theologiae partes quod attinet, iam venenosos peperisse fructus. In dubium revocatur humanam rationem, absque divinae "revelationis" divinaeque gratiae auxilio, argumentis ex creatis rebus deductis demonstrare posse Deum personalem exsistere; negatur mundum initium habuisse, atque contenditur creationem mundi necessariam esse, cum ex necessaria liberalitate divini amoris procedat; aeterna et infallibilis liberarum actionum hominum praescientia Deo item denegatur; quae quidem Vaticani Concilii declarationibus adversantur (cfr. Conc. Vat. Const. *De Fide cath.* cap. 1, *De Deo rerum omnium creatore*).

26. Quaestio etiam a nonnullis agitur num Angeli creaturae personales sint; numque materia a spiritu essentialiter differat. Alii veram "gratuitatem" ordinis supernaturalis corrumpunt, cum autument Deum entia intellectu praedita condere non posse, quin eadem ad beatificam visionem ordinet et vocet. Nec satis; nam peccati originalis notio, definitionibus tridentinis posthabitis, pervertitur, unaque simul peccati in universum, prout est Dei offensa, itemque satisfactionis a Christo pro nobis exhibitae. Nec desunt qui contendant transubstantiationis doctrinam, utpote antiquata notione philosophica substantiae innixam, ita emendandam esse ut realis Christi praesentia in SS. Eucharistia ad quemdam symbolismum reducatur, quatenus consecratae species, nonnisi signa efficacia sint spiritualis praesentiae Christi eiusque intimae coniunctionis cum fidelibus membris in Corpore Mystico.

27. Quidam censent se non devinciri doctrina paucis ante annis in Encyclicis Nostris Litteris exposita, ac fontibus "revelationis" innixa, quae quidem docet corpus Christi mysticum et Ecclesiam Catholicam Romanam unum idemque esse (cfr. Litt. Enc. *Mystici Corporis Christi, A.A.S.* vol. xxxv, p. 193 sq.). Aliqui necessitatem pertinendi ad veram Ecclesiam, ut sempiterna attingatur salus, ad vanam formulam reducunt. Alii denique rationali indoli "credibilitatis" fidei christianae iniuriam inferunt.

28. Haec et alia id genus iam serpere constat inter nonnullos filios Nostros, quos incautum animarum studium vel falsi nominis

scientia decipiunt, quibusque maerenti animo et notissimas veritates repetere cogimur et manifestos errores errorisque pericula non sine anxitudine indicare.

29. In comperto est quanti Ecclesia humanam rationem faciat, quod pertinet ad exsistentiam unius Dei personalis certo demonstrandam, itemque ad ipsius christianae fidei fundamenta signis divinis invicte comprobanda; parique modo ad legem quam Creator animis hominum indidit, rite exprimendam; ac denique ad aliquam mysteriorum intellegentiam assequendam eamque fructuosissimam (cfr. Conc. Vat. D. B. 1796). Hoc tamen munus ratio tum solum apte ac tuto absolvere poterit, cum debito modo exculta fuerit; nempe cum fuerit sana illa philosophia imbuta, quae veluti patrimonium iamdudum exstat a superioribus christianis aetatibus traditum, atque adeo altioris etiam ordinis auctoritatem habet, quia ipsum Magisterium Ecclesiae, eius principia ac praecipua asserta, a viris magni ingenii paulatim patefacta ac definita, ad ipsius divinae "revelationis" trutinam vocavit. Quae quidem philosophia in Ecclesia agnita ac recepta, et verum sincerumque cognitionis humanae valorem tuetur, et metaphysica inconcussa principia—rationis nempe sufficientis, causalitatis, et finalitatis—ac demum certae et immutabilis veritatis assecutionem.

30. In hac philosophia plura sane exponuntur, quibus res fidei et morum neque directe nec indirecte attinguntur, quaeque propterea Ecclesia liberae peritorum disceptationi permittit; at quoad alia plura, praesertim quoad principia assertaque praecipua, quae supra memoravimus, eadem libertas non viget. Etiam in huiusmodi essentialibus quaestionibus, philosophiam quidem aptiore ac ditiore veste induere licet, efficacioribus dictionibus communire, quibusdam scholarum adminiculis minus aptis exuere, sanis quoque quibusdam elementis progredientis humanae lucubrationis caute locupletare; numquam tamen eam subvertere fas est, vel falsis principiis contaminare, vel quasi magnum quidem, sed obsoletum existimare monumentum. Non enim veritas omnisque eius philosophica declaratio in dies mutari possunt, cum potissimum agatur de principiis humanae menti per se notis, vel de sententiis illis, quae tum saeculorum sapientia, tum etiam divinae "revelationis" consensu ac fulcimine innituntur. Quidquid veri mens humana, sincere quaerens, invenire poterit, iam acquisitae veritati profecto adversari nequit; siquidem Deus, summa Veritas, humanum in-

tellectum condidit atque regit, non ut rite acquisitis cotidie nova opponat, sed ut, remotis erroribus qui forte irrepserint, verum vero superstruat eodem ordine ac compagine quibus ipsa rerum natura, ex qua verum hauritur, constituta cernitur. Quapropter christianus, sive philosophus, sive theologus, non festinanter ac leviter amplectatur quidquid novi in dies excogitatum fuerit, sed summa sedulitate id perpendat ac iusta in trutina ponat, ne adeptam veritatem amittat, vel corrumpat, gravi profecto cum ipsius fidei discrimine ac detrimento.

31. Quae si bene perspecta fuerint, facile patebit cur Ecclesia exigat ut futuri sacerdotes philosophicis disciplinis instruantur "ad Angelici Doctoris rationem, doctrinam et principia" (*C. I. C.* can. 1366, 2), quandoquidem plurium saeculorum experientia probe noscit Aquinatis methodum ac rationem sive in tironibus erudiendis, sive in absconditis veritatibus pervestigandis, singulari praestantia eminere; ipsius autem doctrinam cum divina "revelatione" quasi quodam concentu consonare, atque ad fidei fundamenta in tuto collocanda efficacissimam esse, necnon ad sani progressionis fructus utiliter et secure colligendos (*A. A. S.* vol. xxxviii, 1946, p. 387).

32. Hac de causa quam maxime deplorandum est, philosophiam in Ecclesia receptam ac agnitam hodie a nonullis despectui haberi, ita ut antiquata quoad formam, rationalistica, ut aiunt, quoad cogitandi processum, impudenter renuntietur. Dictitant enim hanc nostram philosophiam perperam opinionem tueri metaphysicam absolute veram exsistere posse; dum contra asseverant res, praesertim transcendentes, non aptius exprimi posse, quam disparatis doctrinis, quae sese mutuo compleant, quamvis sibi invicem quodammodo opponantur. Quare philosophiam nostris traditam scholis, cum sua lucida quaestionum descriptione ac solutione, cum accurata sua notionum determinatione clarisque distinctionibus, utilem quidem esse posse concedunt ad propaedeusim scholasticae theologiae, mentibus hominum medii aevi egregie accommodatam; non tamen praebere philosophandi rationem, quae hodiernae nostrae culturae ac necessitatibus respondeat. Opponunt deinde philosophiam perennem nonnisi philosophiam immutabilium essentiarum esse, dum hodierna mens ad "exsistentiam" singulorum spectet necesse est et ad vitam semper fluentem. Dum vero hanc philosophiam despiciunt, alias extollunt sive antiquas, sive recentes, sive Orientis, sive Occidentis populorum, ita ut in animos insin-

uare videantur quamlibet philosophiam vel opinationem, quibusdam additis, si opus fuerit, correctionibus vel complementis, cum dogmate catholico componi posse; quod quidem falsum omnino esse, cum praesertim de commentis illis agatur, quae vel "immanentismum" vocant, vel "idealismum", vel "materialismum" sive historicum, sive dialecticum, ac vel etiam "exsistentialismum" sive atheismum profitentem, sive saltem valori ratiocinii metaphysici adversantem, catholicus nemo in dubium revocare potest.

33. Ac denique philosophiae nostris traditae scholis hoc vitio vertunt, eam nempe in cognitionis processu ad intellectum unice respicere, neglecto munere voluntatis et affectuum animi. Quod quidem verum non est. Numquam enim christiana philosophia utilitatem negavit et efficacitatem bonarum totius animi dispositionum ad res religiosas ac morales plene cognoscendas et amplectendas; immo semper docuit huiuscemodi dispositionum defectum causam esse posse cur intellectus, cupiditatibus ac mala voluntate affectus, ita obscuretur ut non recte videat. Immo Doctor Communis censet intellectum altiora bona ad ordinem moralem sive naturalem sive supernaturalem pertinentia, aliquo modo percipere posse, quatenus experiatur in animo affectivam quamdam "connaturalitatem" cum eisdem bonis sive naturalem, sive dono gratiae additam (cfr. S. Th. *Summa Theol.* 2^a 2^{ae} quaest. 1, art. 4 ad 3 et quest. 45, art. 2, in c.) ; ac liquet quantopere vel suboscura huiusmodi cognitio investigationibus rationis auxilio esse valeat. Attamen aliud est voluntatis affectuum dispositioni vim agnoscere adiuvandi rationem ad certiorem ac firmiorem cognitionem rerum moralium assequendam; aliud vero est, quod isti novatores contendunt: facultatibus nempe appetendi et affectandi vim quamdam intuendi adiudicare, atque hominem, cum non possit rationis discursu cum certitudine discernere quidnam ut verum sit amplectendum, ad voluntatem declinare, qua inter oppositas opiniones ipse libere decernens eligat, cognitione et voluntatis actu incompte permixtis.

34. Nec mirum est novis hisce placitis in discrimen adduci duas philosophicas disciplinas, quae natura sua cum fidei doctrina arcte conectuntur, theodiceam nempe et ethicam; quarum quidem munus esse censent non aliquid certi de Deo aliove ente transcendenti demonstrare, sed ostendere potius ea quae fides doceat de Deo personali ac de eius praeceptis, cum vitae necessitatibus perfecte cohaerere, ideoque omnibus amplectenda esse ut desperatio arcea-

tur atque aeterna attingatur salus. Quae omnia ut Decessorum Nostrorum Leonis XIII et Pii X documentis aperte adversantur, ita cum Concilii Vaticani decretis componi nequeunt. Has quidem a veritate aberrationes deplorare supervacaneum esset, si omnes, etiam in rebus philosophicis, qua par est reverentia ad Magisterium Ecclesiae animum intenderent, cuius profecto est, ex divina institutione, non solum veritatis divinitus revelatae depositum custodire et interpretari, sed ipsis etiam philosophicis disciplinis invigilare, ne quid detrimenti ex placitis non rectis catholica patiantur dogmata.

35. Reliquum est ut aliquid de quaestionibus dicamus, quae quamvis spectent ad disciplinas, quae "positivae" nuncupari solent, cum christianae tamen fidei veritatibus plus minusve connectantur. Instanter enim non pauci expostulant ut catholica religio earumdem disciplinarum quam plurimum rationem habeat. Quod sane laude dignum est ubi de factis agitur reapse demonstratis; caute tamen accipiendum est ubi potius de "hypothesibus" sit quaestio, etsi aliquo modo humana scientia innixis, quibus doctrina attingitur in Sacris Litteris vel in "traditione" contenta. Quodsi tales coniecturales opiniones doctrinae a Deo revelatae directe vel indirecte adversentur, tum huiusmodi postulatum nullo modo admitti potest.

36. Quamobrem Ecclesiae Magisterium non prohibet quominus "evolutionismi" doctrina, quatenus nempe de humani corporis origine inquirit ex iam exsistente ac vivente materia oriundi—animas enim a Deo immediate creari catholica fides nos retinere iubet—pro hodierno humanarum disciplinarum et sacrae theologiae statu, investigationibus ac disputationibus peritorum in utroque campo hominum pertractetur; ita quidem ut rationes utriusque opinionis, faventium nempe, vel obstantium, debita cum gravitate moderatione ac temperantia perpendantur ac diiudicentur; dummodo omnes parati sint ad Ecclesiae iudicio obtemperandum, cui a Christo munus demandatum est et Sacras Scripturas authentice interpretando et fidei dogmata tuendi (cfr. Allocut. Pont. ad membra Academiae Scientiarum, 30 novembris 1941: *A. A. S.* vol. xxxiii, p. 506). Hanc tamen disceptandi libertatem nonnulli temerario ausu transgrediuntur, cum ita sese gerant quasi si ipsa humani corporis origo ex iam exsistente ac vivente materia per indicia hucusque reperta ac per ratiocinia ex iisdem indiciis de-

ducta, iam certa omnino sit ac demonstrata; atque ex divinae revelationis fontibus nihil habeatur, quod in hac re maximam moderationem et cautelam exigat.

37. Cum vero de alia coniecturali opinione agitur, videlicet de polygenismo, quem vocant, tum Ecclesiae filii eiusmodi libertate minime fruuntur. Non enim christifideles eam sententiam amplecti possunt, quam qui retinent asseverant vel post Adam hisce in terris veros homines exstitisse, qui non ab eodem prouti omnium protoparente, naturali generatione originem duxerint, vel Adam significare multitudinem quamdam protoparentum; cum nequaquam appareat quomodo huiusmodi sententia componi queat cum iis quae fontes revelatae veritatis et acta Magisterii Ecclesiae proponunt de peccato originali, quod procedit ex peccato vere commisso ab uno Adamo, quodque generatione in omnes transfusum, inest unicuique proprium (cfr. *Rom.* 5, 12-19; Conc. Trid. sess. v, can. 1-4).

38. Quemadmodum autem in biologicis et anthropologicis disciplinis, ita etiam in historicis sunt qui limites et cautelas ab Ecclesia statuta audacter transgrediantur. Ac peculiari modo deploranda est quaedam nimio liberior libros historicos Veteris Testamenti interpretandi ratio, cuius fautores Epistulam haud ita multo ante a Pontificio Consilio de re biblica Archiepiscopo Parisiensi datam ad suam defendendam causam immerito referunt (die 16 ianuarii 1948: *A. A. S.* vol. xl, pp. 45-48). Haec enim Epistula aperte monet undecim priora capita Geneseos, quamvis cum historicae compositionis rationibus proprie non conveniant, quibus eximii rerum gestarum scriptores graeci et latini, vel nostrae aetatis periti usi fuerint, nihilominus quodam vero sensu, exegetis amplius investigando ac determinando, ad genus historiae pertinere; eademque capita, oratione simplici ac figurata mentique populi parum exculti accommodata, tum praecipuas veritates referre, quibus aeterna nostra procuranda salus innititur, tum etiam popularem descriptionem originis generis humani populique electi. Si quid autem hagiographi antiqui ex narrationibus popularibus hauserint (quod quidem concedi potest), numquam obliviscendum est eos ita egisse divinae inspirationis afflatu adiutos, quo in seligendis ac diiudicandis documentis illis ab omni errore immunes praemuniebantur.

39. Quae autem ex popularibus narrationibus in Sacris Litteris recepta sunt, ea cum mythologiis aliisve id genus minime aequanda

sunt, quae magis ex effusa imaginatione procedunt quam ex illo veritatis ac simplicitatis studio, quod in Sacris Libris Veteris etiam Testamenti adeo elucet ut hagiographi nostri antiquos profanos scriptores aperte praecellere dicendi sint.

40. Novimus quidem plerosque catholicos doctores, quorum studiorum fructus in athenaeis, in sacris seminariis et religiosorum sodalium collegiis impertiuntur, ab iis erroribus alienos esse, qui hodie, sive ob rerum novarum cupidinem, sive etiam ob immoderatum quoddam apostolatus propositum, aperte vel latenter divulgantur. At novimus quoque novas eiusmodi opinationes incautos allicere posse; ideoque principiis obstare malumus, quam inveterato iam morbo medicinam praestare.

41. Quapropter, re coram Domino mature perpensa ac considerata, ne a sacro Nostro officio deficiamus, Episcopis ac Religiosarum Sodalitatum Moderatoribus, gravissime eorum onerata conscientia, praecipimus, ut quam diligentissime curent, ne in scholis, in coetibus, in scriptis quibuslibet opiniones huiusmodi proferantur, neve clericis vel christifidelibus quovis modo tradantur.

42. Qui in ecclesiasticis institutis docent, noverint se tuta conscientia munus docendi, sibi concreditum, exercere non posse, nisi doctrinae normas, quas ediximus, religiose accipiant atque ad amussim servent in discipulis instituendis. Debitam reverentiam atque obtemperationem, quam in suo adsiduo labore Ecclesiae Magisterio profiteantur oportet, discipulorum quoque mentibus animisque instillent.

43. Nitantur utique omni vi omnique contentione ut disciplinas, quas tradunt, provehant; sed caveant etiam ne limites transgrediantur a Nobis statutos ad veritatem fidei ac doctrinae catholicae tuendam. In quaestiones novas, quas hodierna cultura ac progrediens aetas in medium protulerunt, diligentissimam suam conferant pervestigationem, sed ea qua par est prudentia et cautela; nec denique putent, falso "irenismo" indulgentes, ad Ecclesiae sinum dissidentes et errantes feliciter reduci posse, nisi integra veritas in Ecclesia vigens, absque ulla corruptione detractioneque, sincere omnibus tradatur.

44. Hac spe freti, quam pastoralis vestra sollertia adauget, caelestium munerum auspicem paternaeque benevolentiae Nostrae testem, cum vobis singulis universis, Venerabiles Fratres, tum

clero populoque vestro Apostolicam Benedictionem amantissime impertimus.

45. Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, die XII mensis Augusti, anno MDCCCCL, Pontificatus Nostri duodecimo.

PIUS PP. XII

THE CONDEMNATION OF FATHER SOUTHWELL

After Mr. *Cook* had declaimed as long as he thought fit against the servant of *Christ,* and *Topcliffe* and Lord Chief Justice *Popham* had loaded him with reproaches and injuries, to which Father *Southwell* opposed a Christian constancy and modesty, the jury went aside to consult about the verdict, and a short time after brought him in *guilty*. He was asked if he had anything more to say for himself why sentence should not be pronounced against him. He said, *Nothing; but from my heart I beg of Almighty God to forgive all who have been any ways accessory to my death.* The judge, *Popham,* exhorted him to provide for the welfare of his soul whilst he had time. He thanked him for this shew of good-will, saying *That he had long since provided for that, and was conscious to himself of his own innocence.* The judge having pronounced sentence according to the usual form, Father *Southwell* made a very low bow, returning him most hearty thanks as for an unspeakable favour. The judge offered him the help of a minister to prepare him to die. Father *Southwell* desired *he would not trouble him upon that head, that the grace of God would be more than sufficient for him.* And so being sent back to *Newgate* through the streets lined with people, he discovered all the way the overflowing joy of his heart, in his eyes, in his whole countenance, and in every gesture and motion of his body. He was again put down into *Limbo* at his return to *Newgate,* where he spent the following night, the last of his life, in prayer, full of the thoughts of the journey he was to take the next day through the gates of martyrdom into a happy eternity, to enjoy for ever the sovereign object of his love. The next morning he was called to the combat, and . . . gained a glorious victory.

Bishop Challoner, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests* (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne Limited, 1924), pp. 216 f.

Book Reviews

THE MORAL PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE SIN OF DETRACTION AND AN APPLICATION OF THESE PRINCIPLES TO SPECIFIC CASES. The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology, Second Series, 41. By Kenneth B. Moore, O.Carm. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1950. Pp. 176. $2.00.

This doctrinal dissertation is a welcome addition to the sum of works we possess in Moral Theology. For, with rare exceptions, the subject it treats has been neglected by the professional theologians for the past twenty years or more.

Here happily we are provided with an extended treatment of almost every phase of the matter. We are even given an alternate reading of St. Augustine's famous couplet:

> Who gnaws good names with biting jest
> Is at this board unwelcome guest.

The author insists from the outset that detraction is a matter first and foremost of justice and not merely of charity. This is a point on which many of our people are confused. Confessors and preachers can do a great deal of good simply by giving the correct notion of the precise malice of this sin.

One of the opening chapters gives a thorough explanation of the notion of reputation, of the ways in which it can be injured, and in particular of that offense which constitutes the subject matter of the thesis. On p. 36 will be found one of those inadvertent errors which manage to bedevil writers. The sentence in question should be corrected to read, "These authors first distinguish between an open attack on one's good name and a secret attack." The statement which follows can then be left as it stands. While on this subject I might mention that the only other minor slip to come to my attention appears in the opening sentence of Chapter III. Obviously the word "chapter" is not what the author meant to write there.

The section on the nature of the sin of detraction is most informative. The cases in which it is licit to reveal the secret sin or defect of a neighbor are fully explained. The confessor can make good use of all this, for when this sin is mentioned it is wise to inquire always as to whether there might have been a proportionate reason for speaking as one did.

The second article of this same chapter must have cost the author many hours of hard work. For he aims to explain there what remains a